SCOTTISH JOURNAL

of

THEOLOGY

Vol. 14, *No.* 3 *September* 1961

EDITORS:

REV. PROFESSOR T. F. TORRANCE

REV. PROFESSOR J. K. S. REID

OLIVER & BOYD LTD.

EDINBURGH: TWEEDDALE COURT

LONDON: 39A WELBECK STREET, W.1

SCOTTISH JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY

Published Quarterly

Editors:

Rev. Prof. T. F. Torrance, M.B.E., D.D., D.Theol.,
21 South Oswald Road, Edinburgh, 9 (Telephone NEW 6114)

Rev. Prof. J. K. S. Reid, D.D.,
90 St. Machar Drive, Aberdeen

Consulting Editors:

Very Rev. Principal J. H. S. Burleigh, D.D., B.Litt.
Chairman of Directors

Rev. Prof. David Cairns, D.D.

Rev. Prof. N. W. Porteous, D.D.

Rev. Prof. A. M. Hunter, Ph.D., D.Phil., D.D.

Directors:

The above-named together with

Rev. Prof. E. P. Dickie, M.C., D.D.

Rev. J. Heron, B.D., S.T.M.

Rev. Stewart Mechie, D.D.

Rev. T. M. Murchison, M.A.

Rev. J. A. McFadden, B.D.

Rev. J. W. Stevenson, M.A.

Rev. J. B. Torrance, B.D.

Rev. R. S. Wallace, M.A., B.Sc., Ph.D.

Rev. D. B. Thomson, M.A., M.Th., *Secretary*

CONTRIBUTIONS are invited from members of all branches of the Christian Church.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE—MSS and Books for review should be sent to one of the Editors.

BUSINESS CORRESPONDENCE should be sent to the Registered Office.

PRICE: Six Shillings and Sixpence (U.S.A. and CANADA $1.00) per copy, post free.

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION: Twenty-four Shillings, post free. (U.S.A. and CANADA $4.00.)

PUBLISHED BY OLIVER AND BOYD FOR SCOTTISH JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY LTD.

Registered Office: TWEEDDALE COURT, EDINBURGH, 1

CONTENTS

PAGE

KARL BARTH AND OSCAR CULLMANN ON THEIR THEOLOGICAL VOCATION, by Professor Karl Barth, Basel, and Professor Oscar Cullmann, Basel and Paris, translated by Terence N. Tice 225

WHO DOES HE THINK HE IS?, by the Rev. Harry Hutchison, B.D., Ph.D., Stanstead, Quebec 234

THE TRINITARIAN THEOLOGY OF AUGUSTINE AND HIS DEBT TO PLOTINUS, by the Rev. Professor Thomas A. Wassmer, S.J., Ph.D., New Jersey 248

THE DATE AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE LAST SUPPER, by the Rev. A. Gilmore, M.A., B.D., Northampton 256

THE APOSTLES' DOCTRINE AND FELLOWSHIP, by the Rev. I. M. Fraser, M.A., B.D., Ph.D., Dunblane 270

THE MARCAN FRAMEWORK, by the Rev. Harry Sawyerr, M.B.E., M.A., M.Ed., Fourah Bay 279

BOOK REVIEWS:

Emil Brunner: *Die Christliche Lehre von der Kirche, vom Glauben und von der Vollendung. Dogmatik*, Band III, by the Rev. Dr Rudolf J. Ehrlich, Edinburgh 295

Karl Barth: *Anselm: Fides quaerens intellectum*, by the Rev. Dr James W. Leitch, Rotterdam 297

Georgia Harkness: *John Calvin: the Man and his Ethics*, by the Rev. T. H. L. Parker, Great Ponton 299

Heinrich Suso Braun: *Jesus als Mensch*, by the Rev. Dr Rudolf J. Ehrlich, Edinburgh 299

Georg Fohrer: *Züricher Bibelkommentare: Das Buch Jesaja*, 1. Band, Kap. 1.23, by the Rev. J. C. Campbell, Dunnottar 300

Thorlief Boman (tr. Jules L. Moreau): *Hebrew Thought Compared with Greek Thought*, by the Rev. Dr Norman H. Snaith, Leeds 301

L. Cerfaux: *The Four Gospels: an historical introduction*, by the Rev. R. S. Barbour, Edinburgh 303

F. C. Grant: *The Gospels, their Origin and their Growth*, by the Rev. Dr R. McL. Wilson, St. Andrews 304

Walther Lüthi: *St. John's Gospel: an Exposition*, by the Rev. Professor James S. Stewart, Edinburgh 307

A. J. B. Higgins: *The Historicity of the Fourth Gospel*, by the Rev. Dr R. McL. Wilson, St. Andrews 309

Walther von Loewenich: *Paul. His Life and Work*, by the Rev. H. A. Shepherd, Edinburgh 310

Paul T. Fuhrmann: *An Introduction to the Great Creeds of the Church*, by the Rev. Dr James K. Cameron, St. Andrews 311

André Bénoît: *Saint Irénée: Introduction à l'étude de sa théologie*, by Dr J. A. B. Holland, Edinburgh 312

Olive J. Brose: *Church and Parliament. The Reshaping of the Church of England, 1828-1860*, by the Rev. Basil Hall, Cambridge 317

CONTENTS

F-J. Leenhardt: *Ceci est mon corps*, by the Rev. Professor William Nicholls, Vancouver 318
E. L. Kendall: *A Living Sacrifice—a Study in Reparation*, by the Rev. Dr A. K. Robertson, Langton, Duns 321
John Kennedy: *Presbyterian Authority and Discipline*, by the Rev. Dr James Bulloch, Stobo 322
John A. Mackay: *The Presbyterian Way of Life*, by the Rev. Dr R. Stuart Louden, Edinburgh 324
John Sutherland: *Godly Upbringing: A Survey of Sunday Schools and Bible Classes in the Church of Scotland*, by the Rev. C. E. B. Cranfield, Durham 326
George Scott-Moncrieff: *The Mirror and the Cross: Scotland and the Catholic Faith*, by the Rev. Dr James Bulloch, Stobo 328
Douglas N. Sargent: *The Making of a Missionary*, by the late Rev. Dr George S. Gunn, Edinburgh 329
Charles Davis: *Liturgy and Doctrine*; Massey H. Shepherd: *The Paschal Liturgy and the Apocalypse*, by the Rev. Dr John A. Lamb, Edinburgh 329
Robert Leuenberger: *Das Magnificat. Eine evangelische Betrachtung des Lobsgesanges der Maria*; Robert N. Rodenmayer: *Thanks Be To God*, by the Rev. Dr John A. Lamb, Edinburgh 330
S. J. P. van Dijk and J. Hazelden Walker: *The Origins of the Modern Roman Liturgy*; A. Crogaert: *The Mass: A Liturgical Commentary*, by the Rev. Dr John A. Lamb, Edinburgh 331
D. R. Dendy: *The Use of Lights in Christian Worship*, by the Rev. Professor William D. Maxwell, Grahamstown, South Africa 333
Books Received 335

IN THIS ISSUE

Barth and Cullmann on Theological Vocation and articles on
Christ's Self-Witness
Augustine and Plotinus
the Lord's Supper
the Apostolic Doctrine and Fellowship

The Bible Study is on Mark

Among the reviews are
Brunner's Dogmatik III
Barth on Anselm's Fides Quaerens Intellectum
and works on

Hebrew and Greek Thought
the Four Gospels
the Fourth Gospel
St. Irenaeus
the Holy Communion
Presbyterian Discipline and Life
the Roman Liturgy

KARL BARTH AND OSCAR CULLMANN ON THEIR THEOLOGICAL VOCATION

I

ON SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY[1]

by PROFESSOR KARL BARTH

ATTEMPTING to account to myself how I actually came into the field of systematic theology requires reaching back to my sixteenth year, to the confirmation instruction I experienced at that time. It was extraordinary in its own way. I learned then, for example, that very dubious undertakings are involved in the five medieval proofs for the existence of God and in the later orthodox theory of the literal inspiration of the Bible. Much more important, however, I learned that it would be a fine and excellent thing not only to identify and to affirm the great articles of the Christian confession of faith but also to understand them from inside out. On the eve of my confirmaton day I boldly resolved to become a theologian, perhaps not so much with the thought of preaching, cure of souls and the like, but rather in the hope of realising in the course of this study some substantial understanding of a confession of faith of which I had only a vague apprehension. As yet I knew nothing of Anselm and his programme of *fides quaerens intellectum* and therefore also nothing of what I was undertaking as 'theology' in general or even of what 'systematic' theology was in particular. Upon entering the University, the theoretical and practical philosophy of Kant together with Schleiermacher's analysis of religion and faith became my guiding stars. To the prevailing tendency of about 1910 among the younger followers of Albrecht Ritschl I attached myself with passable conviction. Yet it was not without a certain alienation in view of the issue of this school in the philosophy of religion of Ernst Troeltsch, in which I found myself disappointed in regard to

[1] Authorised translation by Terrence N. Tice from *Lehre und Forschung an der Universität Basel zur Zeit der Feier ihres fünfhundertjährigen Bestehens*, dargestellt von Dozenten der Universität Basel (Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 1960), pp. 35-38.

what interested me in theology, although for the time being I did not see a better way before me. It was extremely fruitful for me, as I now entered upon twelve years in the pastorate, to be compelled to engage myself much more earnestly than ever before with the Bible as the root of all Christian thinking and teaching. The apostle Paul became in a special way for me a guide to the truth and clarity of the biblical witness. Essentially on the basis of this impetus received from Paul, a perspective began to take form in me concerning what might be involved in the *fides quaerens intellectum* which led me rather far away from that tradition of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries which I had previously affirmed. It was only verified for me, however, after having been called to an academic post, when I had to come to terms for the first time on a broad basis with both old and modern forms and tendencies of systematic theology and, in the centre, with the theology of the Reformation.

The view of the role of investigation in systematic theology which I acquired at that time and subsequently more thoroughly developed—to sketch it with the brevity required here—is this: with all the previous course of Christian thinking and teaching fixed before one's eyes, to trace out the message of the Old and New Testaments, as analysed in its particulars by biblical-exegetical theology, in its unity and totality (and to that extent to trace it out 'systematically'). In this message, systematic theology has not only its real but also its epistemological ground. It has not to anticipate it, therefore, with any general metaphysics, theory of knowledge, ontology or even philosophy of religion taken as bearing upon it normatively. Nor has it even to subject it to the law of any churchly tradition. In no sense has it to dominate this message. It has to serve it. It has to recount its utterance completely, coherently and consistently (and, again, to this extent 'systematically'). It has to allow it the first word and the last, so that by reflex action from the exposition it may speak for itself. It asks (as 'Church *Dogmatics*') after *the* 'dogma', i.e. after the *norm* of Christian thought and speech which is supreme over dogmatics as it is supreme over the entire Church. In the measure that it respects the message which is its object and source and in this very freedom pertaining to its work, it is itself (over

against the Christian as well as the non-Christian world) really *free* science.

The aim of teaching systematic theology, as I see it, consists in the student's learning to orientate his thought as rigorously as possible within the message entrusted to the Church, a practice which is indispensable for his future work as pastor of a church as well as for any academic occupation which may fall to him later on. This comprises, above all, the responsibility of inciting in him an interest and love for this inexhaustible real ground and epistemological basis of the science of systematic theology; further, of releasing him from the cramping constraints and deteriorating distractions which may arise in the course of forming religious opinions and also, of course, of putting him on his guard against purblind repetition of the particular theses of his teacher; and finally, of directing him towards independent pursuits, but also towards self-discipline in carrying them out. In lectures, the student has the opportunity to join receptively with me in the generation of each successive section of my *Church Dogmatics*. In seminar, I lay the whole weight upon introducing him to the art of the analytical and critical reading of such classical and modern texts as are ready to hand; while in the *Societät*, in the English Colloquium and in the French Colloquium he is invited to direct questions, thoughts and objections to me face to face and to entertain my attempts at clarification.

In conclusion, a few indications concerning my view of the general significance of work in systematic theology. I understand this to be a function necessary to the life of the Church, as is true of the whole of theology, in view of the Church's commission to go out into all the world. The Church lives by the message which is its foundation and which is to be proclaimed by it as God's Word directed towards all men. Its responsibility over against this Word is great. In every age it is under obligation to confront its practice with this Word, to subject itself to its control, criticism and correction. Consequently, in every new age and situation it must renew the work of systematic theology in particular. Because warrant (*Zuspruch*) and claim (*Anspruch*), promise and command, bestowal (*Gabe*) and mission (*Aufgabe*) in the Word of God—and, in its reception, faith and obedience, knowledge and action—

form an inseparable unity, and because the practice of the Church must also order itself accordingly, what is called ethics forms an integral part of systematic theology. This implies that its thinking and language always have at once an indicative and an imperative character. Thus, in respect to its relation to the actual existence of the Church, systematic theology is Church science, '*Church* Dogmatics'. In every other respect it takes its life from the truth of that message which both it and the Church has continually to recollect. It cannot wish to prove the truth of the Word of God either directly or indirectly. The victory and triumph of this truth *intra et extra muros ecclesiae* cannot be its work. Since it actually relies upon this truth, it can only attest it in its own particular manner. It can only trust that the truth will prove itself. This trust is its ('apologetic') strength in relation to the whole cumulation of Christian and non-Christian thought-forms, ideologies, myths, world-views and religions. In this trust it can and ought to encounter them all, knowing its own business and, precisely on this account, meeting them openly, forbearingly and full of understanding, with great hope for those men who are still trapped within them. In this trust it endeavours wherever possible to do both pure and thorough intellectual work, faithful in the midst of the other sciences to its own law. When taken hold of by this trust, systematic theology is not only a peculiarly free science, but, for all the heavy responsibility and toil of its efforts, a peculiarly *care*free and, indeed, *gay* science. Thus have I come to know it. And therefore I do not regret having sought in just this place my intellectual home.

II

AN AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH[1]

by Professor OSCAR CULLMANN

In a framework of biographical dates, I shall attempt to show here what my earlier development signifies for my Basel professorship, and, in turn, what this professorship signifies for my subsequent work.

[1] Authorised translation by Terrence N. Tice from *Lehre und Forschung an der Universität Basel zur Zeit der Feier ihres fünfhundertjährigen Bestehens*, dargestellt von Dozenten der Universität Basel (Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 1960), pp. 24-28.

The manner in which I came into theology was unusual, in that I began not with the intention of becoming a pastor but out of interest in the subject-matter as such, which I had indeed at first considered as rather a secondary study. In the school of my home town, Strassburg—at that time German—the religious instruction lay largely in the hands of theologians coming from Württemberg, who, with the enthusiasm and candour of the generation preceding the First World War, were advocating theological liberalism. Through these teachers as well as the pastors of the entirely liberal *Aurelienkirche*, I was strengthened in my aversion to all orthodoxy In the *Obersekunda* class of secondary school,[1] I read Schleiermacher's *Addresses on Religion* for myself. This reading was inspiring to me. Along with the encouragement of my German and History teacher (C. Hauter), later professor of theology, it gave not a little impetus to my decision to study theology in addition to classical philology.

This double study I began in Strassburg—which had meanwhile returned to France. After initially laying emphasis upon ancient philology, the specifically philological and historical branches of theology (at first only these) soon engaged my attention more forcibly, although I have always viewed my classical studies as especially important for laying hold of what is new in New Testament theology, and still do so. The reading of *The Quest of the Historical Jesus* of my countryman, Albert Schweitzer, opened my eyes to the realisation that historico-exegetical investigation of the Bible had been falsified not only by orthodoxy but in recent times even more severely by prevailing currents of philosophy. Therefore I experienced the advent of *Formgeschichte* as a liberation. Previously scholars had attempted to make distinctions between essential and unessential, genuine and spurious elements, often using criteria issuing from various world-views. Now the arbitrariness of such attempts was to be cleared away and inquiry directed instead to the rules of form (*Formgesetzen*) and motifs of faith (*Glaubensmotiven*) which stand behind tradition. My first publication, in 1925, was devoted to this problem. Balden-

[1] The *Obersekunda* (for students *ca.* sixteen years old) was the first of four final years before the *Maturität*, an examination allowing students to pursue university studies.

sperger, my teacher at Strassburg, had already consistently advocated this tendency in his suggestive exegesis. Bultmann now greeted me as an ally.

Today the Bultmann school makes the questionable formal demand that the texts be judged according to their significance for our existentialist 'self-understanding', thus bringing exegesis into an even greater dependence upon prevailing philosophy than its earlier relation to orthodoxy or philosophical idealism had manifested. This later development, of course, was not to be foreseen in those earlier years.

After my final examination in Strassburg I came to Paris as assistant master in Greek and German at the then *École des Batignolles*. I studied concurrently in the theological faculty with M. Goguel, at the Sorbonne with, among others, A. Lods and C. Guignebert, and at the *École des Hautes-Études* with the modernist A. Loisy. I had no presentiment that I should later occupy the chairs of Goguel, Guignebert and Loisy. That year in this extremely stimulating intellectual centre was the most fruitful in my whole apprenticeship. To be sure, neither Goguel nor Guignebert nor Loisy advocated *Formgeschichte*—Goguel even firmly rejected it as a passing fashion—but the encounter with them was nevertheless very stimulating.

In the year 1926 I was called to Strassburg as director of studies at the *Thomasstift* [the theological seminary], and in 1927 was charged with instruction in Greek at the University. From those years dates my book on the Pseudo-Clementines, which interested me both as an early distortion of the Gospel and as a source for the historical problem: syncretism—Judaism—Jewish Christianity. The all too abrupt opposing of Jewish and Gentile Christianity inspired by Hegel has influenced the historical picture of the beginnings of Christianity to the present day, as if an encounter with hellenistic syncretism had only first become possible on Gentile Christian territory. The Pseudo-Clementines indirectly prove that the proclamation of Jesus and of the first Christians was already meeting with a Jewish syncretism in the environment of Palestine. This result has become extensively confirmed through the discovery of the Qumran texts, and today I am carrying this line of thought further in connexion with my studies on the Gospel of John.

In the year 1931 I was nominated Professor of New Testament in the faculty of theology at Strassburg, where work with Jean Héring proved very fruitful. In my lectures, I tried to keep all influence of the modern apprehensions of Christianity which had become dear to me apart from exegesis. It was initially through this purely scientific effort that I gradually attained to a deeper theological understanding of things of which the New Testament speaks but which were then strange to me.

At the same time I carried forward my patristic studies and found it especially stimulating and fruitful to carry my exegetical understanding of the New Testament into the study of Church History and the History of Dogma. After W. Seston, now Professor of Roman History at the Sorbonne, had left the theology faculty at Strassburg, I took over his post in Ancient Church History. Soon after, in 1938, I was called to Basel as the successor of Eberhard Vischer to a chair of Ancient and Medieval Church History, which F. Overbeck had occupied, combined with a professorship in New Testament. It was not easy for me to leave the University of my native city. But the prospect of breaking my all too rectilinear career which, with the exception of my post in Paris, had run entirely within the borders of Strassburg, drew me especially to the happy combination of the Basel theology faculty and to the unique enthusiasm with which both historical and exegetical as well as systematic theology were pursued there at that time, but no less to the execution of my teaching duties in my two fields: Ancient Church History and New Testament.

I had the intention of occupying myself in Basel as much with Church History and Patristics as with New Testament, and in fact I have enjoyed the combination of the two disciplines to this very day. As a New Testament scholar, I am especially glad to be teaching Church History up to the Middle Ages. The task of indicating how the germ of the New Testament came to unfold under the influence of various historical currents and, on the other hand, to become deformed, is particularly interesting. At the same time, it sharpens one's sense for the newness and strangeness of the New Testament revelation, which never allows itself to be forced into any syncretism, no matter how subtly disposed it

may be. Thus it has come about that in the present also the duty of keeping the mingling of modern tendencies of thought apart from exegesis has become more important for me than establishing the assumption that we are all unconsciously involved in presuppositions.

If my later publications have had almost exclusively the New Testament and Early Christianity for their object, they have nonetheless been enriched by my studies in Church History and History of Dogma. That I write less on the later periods may correspond to the practice of conceiving Church History in Switzerland, on the basis of the plan of Church examinations, as a purely introductory field—which in this respect is certainly not entirely propitious. Thus, the subject is pursued by students only at the beginning of their course, so that lectures and seminars in Church History do not bring to bear the same incentive upon professors as those in New Testament do.

So much the stronger was another stimulus which I experienced in Basel from the very beginning, i.e. the association of our faculty with various churches and countries, which has made of it an unusually ecumenical centre for theology, and from the humanistic tradition, which is expressed not only in relations with Basel colleagues from other faculties but also in the whole position of the University within the cultural life of Basel. The relatively small area and the world-wide inclusiveness of Basel are great advantages to our faculty and have meant the enrichment of my writings as well. It is in this atmosphere that my larger works in New Testament have been produced.

My development, here very briefly indicated, was not directly influenced by Karl Barth. It was also entirely different from his. And yet, from my entirely different—originally untheological—point of departure, I have arrived at a demand in which we both find ourselves theologically at one, for all our differences: the demand for obedient listening to the strangeness of the Bible. I am still conscious of this common position, despite our standing in directly correlative relation to each other in our theological instruction. In so far as we do not suppose the occurrence which is the object of the biblical revelation to be one with the experience of faith, but take this

occurrence seriously for what it is, our limits are definitely fixed over against the contemporary Bultmann school.

With my late colleague K. L. Schmidt I had in common the positive apprehension of *Formgeschichte*, according to which the investigation of the strata (*Gesetze*) of tradition not only had the negative aim of establishing the deviation of the early Christian community from Jesus as its object, but was also designed to help us draw nearer to the historical Jesus. Fruitful collaboration has been possible with his successor, Bo Reicke, due to our common conception of exegesis, which has in fact given New Testament research as it is pursued in Basel its particular bearing within the present theological situation.

On the other side, I have the international inclusiveness and generosity of Basel to thank for being able to develop such stimulating relationships and activities outside Basel as I have, in addition to the concentration on scientific work. Concurrently, I have my teaching responsibilities to discharge at the *École des Hautes-Études* in Paris, in the philosophical faculty of the Sorbonne and in the theological faculty in Paris. I should not like to be without the extremely stimulating contact which I have there as a teacher with secular historians, colleagues and students and also with Catholic theologians. Also my activity in Rome and in New York has been beneficial for my work in Basel, just as it is valuable, in turn, to advocate in those foreign centres what I have worked out here. Many of my publications, like my book on Peter, are associated with these foreign relationships, even if Basel is the place where I bring these stimuli to their scientific issue. So long as health permits, therefore, I should like to continue my dual activity in Basel and Paris, regarding Basel as home ground. There are two Basel houses above all which symbolise, in the twofold relation of scientific concentration and ecumenical inclusiveness, what my chair here has meant for my work: the Alumneum in Hebelstrasse with its ecumenical institute, which has been tended by me for twenty years and has become especially dear, and the theological seminar building in Rheinsprung with its open view over that bond between countries and men, the Rhine.

'WHO DOES HE THINK HE IS?'

AN INTERPRETATION OF CHRIST'S SELF-WITNESS

by THE REV. HARRY HUTCHISON

No more important question can be asked than the well-known New Testament inquiry, 'What think ye of Christ?' —unless it be the question, 'What thinks Christ of Himself?' In past decades this question has not, perhaps, been asked as often as it might. Is there a reason for this? Undoubtedly there is. This (it will be claimed) is so controversial a question, with reputable scholars taking widely divergent views, that there seems little point in giving it the importance which many of our forefathers gave to it.

The controversial nature of this question can be pinpointed in two statements by scholars who take the opposite point of view. Roberts and Horder, in their volume *The Philosophy of Jesus*, bluntly comment that 'the doctrine of the divinity of Christ must be taken to express the conception of what Jesus should mean to His followers, rather than as an expression of His own theory about Himself' (p. 51). James Denney, in his *Studies in Theology*, is equally convinced that 'the fundamental thing in Christology is Christ's testimony to Himself' (p. 47). Or again: 'Jesus was the Son of God in a peculiar and unique sense: this was how He conceived Himself, and this is fundamentally how we have to conceive Him' (p. 33).

Is it possible to reconcile these two viewpoints by some verbal gymnastics? Surely not. Whatever 'demythologising' has to be done on the various expressions used by the New Testament to describe Jesus and His relationship with God, we *are* still left with the choice: Did Jesus, or did He not, claim to be 'divine'? Or, if we do not care for the term 'divinity of Christ', the question still stands: Is Christ, in some basic and meaningful sense, God? Those who minimise the New Testament evidence which supports the idea that Christ frankly claimed to be Son of God are anxious to point out that Jesus is remarkably reticent on this matter. Undoubtedly He is. There is much more we would have liked to hear from His own lips. But (leaving

aside for the moment our belief that such evidence is sufficient) could there be a very good reason why such evidence is scanty? Surely part of such a reason lies in the fact that Jesus had to be so cautious in His use of terms (e.g. 'Messiah'), so that He would not mislead His hearers—all of whom would interpret such terms in the traditional way. But, even more important, there is the inescapable fact, witnessed to by the whole New Testament, that Jesus sought to be acknowledged Son of God not as a result of His own authoritative pronouncements about Himself, but as a direct result of the unique impact of His life. This fact is given little weight by those who deny He thought Himself 'divine', but it is hard to see how an honest reading of the New Testament can result in any other conclusion. H. W. Robinson is one of many who believe that this fact must be frankly taken into consideration. He feels that Christ's authority was brought to bear on the disciples 'less by explicit "claims" than by the sheer intrinsic quality of His person and work. The responsive recognition of it was allowed to shape itself gradually and imperfectly' (*The Christian Experience of the Holy Spirit*, p. 111).

This is a point to which we must return. But our immediate concern must be to answer the question: Is the evidence, then, really insufficient to justify our assertion that Jesus frankly claimed to be all that Christians have ever claimed for Him? By no means. Let us examine some of this evidence—evidence which has traditionally been regarded as cogent, but which has regularly been assailed by many modern schools of theology —not least the 'Form Critics'.

What, for example, shall be our assessment of Christ's clear assertion of His sinlessness? Some have criticised the stress which has traditionally been placed on this doctrine on the grounds that it is a negative idea. Perhaps so. Yet how important this negative aspect is! Jesus was *not* the one thing that we all are. He was *not* a sinner. And—most important of all—He knew it. He was, as the writer to the Hebrews puts it, 'tempted in all points like as we are, yet without sin'. But it was not just Christ's contemporaries who realised this. There are few more revealing passages than Matthew's account of Christ's answer to the Pharisees who object to His disciples' plucking ears of corn on the sabbath day: 'Have you not read

in the law how on the sabbath days the priests in the temple profane the sabbath, and are blameless? But I say to you that in this place is One greater than the temple' (12.4f). What could be more categorical than that? Not once in His ministry was He conscious of any moral defect, though He was fully alive to the ravages of sin as they were to be observed in others. It is characteristic of the great Old Testament prophets that they share a deep sense of unworthiness; but Jesus knows nothing of this.

There seems to be only one alternative: to accept Christ's assessment of Himself at its face value, or to assert that He was in some way deluded. Christ was 'aut Deus aut non bonus'. It has, of course, sometimes been remarked that His treatment of the Pharisees, His repudiation of the title 'good', His use of force in cleansing the temple, invalidate the idea that He was sinless. This, surely, can be claimed only by a shallow exegesis of these incidents! They certainly do not amount to positive sinfulness. As W. B. Selbie wrote in his *The Fatherhood of God*, 'the really relevant consideration here is the fact that in the religious consciousness of Jesus there seems to have been no place for contrition, penitence, or the confession of sin. In this respect at least the contrast between Jesus and the saints of all ages is extraordinary. As a rule, the greater the saint the more vivid and vocal is his sense of sin' (p. 159).

There is one vital, practical consequence of this doctrine of Christ's sinlessness, and one which makes it imperative that we do not regard this doctrine as a mere construction of the disciples (as the Form Critics would have us believe), but as originating in Christ's own consciousness. If Christ's claim is denied, it means at once that His testimony on every other point is suspect; for, as modern psychology has often stressed, to be conscious of sin leads to our rationalising much of our experience of life—in fact, rationalising our knowledge and experience of God. 'If the claim to sinlessness on the part of Jesus be allowed,' writes C. Valentine in his book *Modern Psychology and the Validity of Christian Experience*, 'the teaching given by Him must be accepted as all the more worthy of belief, just because, as sinless, He would be free from the inner causes of rationalising.'

But there is more than His claim to sinlessness. He claimed

also to be the judge and forgiver of sin. This, again, is a tremendous claim, and it is no wonder that the demythologisers have spent so much time with the notions of 'judgment' and 'forgiveness'! Let us note, however, that He did make this claim—a claim which the Church has traditionally taken seriously. 'When He saw their faith he said to him, Man, your sins are forgiven you. And the scribes and Pharisees began to reason, saying, Who is this who speaks blasphemies? Who can forgive sins but God alone?' (Luke 5.20f). That was the point. That was why Jesus regarded Himself as One who could be *sinned against.* That is why He, without apology, regards His own death as a sacrifice for sin. 'This is My blood of the new Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins.'

His claim to 'judge' men is, in some respects, even more striking. 'Not every one who says to me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven. . . .' This claim, too, of course, has been attacked on the grounds that this 'judicial side' of Christ contradicts the heart of the Gospel message. Not so! What is it but a clear sign of grace to declare to men, through Christ, that God is far from being a 'Grand Old Man' (as they secretly are hoping), and to let them know they will be judged on the basis of their relationship to the Incarnate Word? Whatever judgment may mean—even in its demythologised form—clearly this is the prerogative of God Himself, and it is precisely this prerogative which Christ claims for Himself. 'When the Son of Man shall come in His glory, and all the holy angels with Him, then shall He sit on the throne of His glory; and before Him shall be gathered all nations, and He shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divides his sheep from the goats . . .' (Matt. 25.31f).

In the long history of Jewish religion men had constantly looked to the final judgment—it was something yet to come. But when Jesus looked into the future, He saw His *own* coming, His *own* judging. He was no prophet, but the very subject and substance of prophecy. His final sentence upon men is equivalent to the 'consummation of the ages'. Blessedness means to be welcomed by Him at His coming, and to be disowned by Him is the ultimate 'punishment' and disaster. Now, we may deny this, or empty these statements of their significance, but we cannot deny that Christ made this claim to be man's

final Judge. He never had qualms about using, or intending to use, His spiritual authority over men. How often, indeed, did He identify Himself with the Gospel, or 'the Kingdom', and demanded men's utter obedience? 'Whosoever shall lose his life for My sake and the gospel's . . .'

It is remarkable how critics will deny the 'divinity of Christ' because He so rarely makes the claim in so many words; for, what could be plainer than these numerous identifications of His own functions with those of God? He promises not to cast out any who come to Him; He makes the staggering claim: 'All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth'; He promises believers the experience of His continual presence; He demands men's loyalty over all other loyalties. These, and dozens more, are claims which say, in effect, 'I am God.' Even supposing some of these claims do occur in passages of doubtful authenticity, how can one resist the overwhelming evidence of Christ's self-witness to be found in every part of the Gospel record?

There are two phrases used to describe Christ which have received a great deal of stress by orthodox theologians concerned to support the New Testament evidence of Christ's self-witness; and we must try, briefly, to assess their importance in the light of more recent thought on Christ's 'messianic self-consciousness'. The first of these is 'the Son of God'. We have already suggested, in passing, one reason why Jesus rarely uses such phrases to describe Himself, and it is, in fact, only in times of crucial importance that He does so. Every Christian is aware of the historic importance of Peter's confession of faith at Caesarea Philippi. This, clearly, is the reason why Jesus gladly accepts the title from him. 'Whom say *ye* that I am? And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.' The same is true of the high priest's question: 'Tell us whether you are Christ, the Son of God.'

Let us not imagine that those who hold the view that Christ accepted the title 'Son of God' are compelled to minimise the fact of Christ's identification with man. It is not a question of 'either—or'. Christ identified Himself with man—there is ample evidence of this in the New Testament!—and yet He does not hesitate on occasion to separate Himself from man. This He does, for example, when He speaks of '*My* Father who is in

heaven'. Indeed, even had He never used the title 'Son of God' there is a vast amount of evidence showing that He fully realised He was 'not a son among others, but *the* Son through whom alone the Father was interpreted to the world.' (The word 'Son', of course, is freely recognised in orthodox theology as a metaphor—and what better word to choose than 'Son' to describe, albeit imperfectly, the closest possible relationship in life?) Christ *did* claim a unique knowledge of God. But on what basis? On the basis of a very special relationship to God. Knowing Himself as 'the Son', Christ revealed God as 'the Father'. 'All things are delivered unto Me from My Father.'

But (suggests the sceptic) what guarantee do we have that Christ accepted this title 'Son of God' in the same sense that orthodox theology today accepts it? After all, did not Nathaniel equate Son of God with 'King of Israel'? Indeed he did. Such a ready identification was one of the powerful reasons why Christ used such titles sparingly. But when He did use it He did so in a much profounder sense than was understood by most of His contemporaries. As Denney has remarked: 'The name Son of God is something more than an official title. It is a title by which Christ seems to detach Himself from men and to speak of God as His Father in an *exclusive* sense.' In view of His other tremendous claims and pronouncements it is shallow reasoning to suppose that Christ uses this title in a simple, theocratic sense. It is preposterous to claim that Jesus is Son of God in the same sense in which the Davidic king is so called in the Psalms (2 and 84). Nor is He this in a simple ethical sense. The total evidence of His life indicates clearly that He uses the term to imply an essential (indeed, 'pre-existent') relationship to the Father whom it was His task to manifest to men.

In other words, we are bound to reject the idea common in 'liberal' circles (and elsewhere) that the title 'Son of God' is an afterthought. Form Criticism would have us believe that this title was utilised by the disciples as soon as, but not before, they recognised Him to be the Messiah. This, of course, is a theory which has had some attraction ever since 'Adoptionism' became popular in the early Church; but such a theory is based on very flimsy evidence and is counter to the plain meaning of the New Testament record. Even if we make allowance for the metaphorical language of John's Gospel, we can hardly escape the

impression of a Man who was 'Son of God' by virtue of His inmost being. Christ's relationship to God is described in terms of a pre-existent life of communion with God; He can say without hesitation: 'No man has seen the Father save He who is of God; He has seen the Father.' He can bluntly claim to have shared God's glory and to have 'come forth from Him' in order to reveal God under the conditions of human life.

Now if this is true, what is the only way in which it could be made evident to human beings? Not by metaphysical reasoning. Rather must this Man be seen to be 'Son of God' as He lived and moved and had His being in the midst of men. If we cannot discern His unique relationship to God there, it is certainly unlikely (indeed, impossible) that we should deduce it in some other way. It was *in* our human nature, not apart from it, that Jesus knew Himself to stand in this unique relationship to God—and this is the truth which is stressed again and again in the New Testament. As the Gospel writers make plain, the very fact of redemption itself is intimately bound up with the dynamic truth of the assertion that Jesus was 'the Son of God'.

Refusal to accept Christ's self-witness as Son of God can, indeed, usually be traced to a viewpoint which puts far greater stress on the metaphysical aspects of Christ's relation to God than on the dynamic. From the times of the early Church, it has been a common and tragic error to conceive of the God-Christ relationship abstractly. As Christians we may easily acknowledge that this relationship involves metaphysical presuppositions, but these certainly do not constitute (far less explain) the relationship! We must not, of course, minimise or try to dismiss the very real problem of the growth of the filial consciousness. But, speculate as we may, the *fact* of this filial consciousness is crystal-clear. Theologians may continue to argue as to the possibility of this consciousness having been communicated at His Baptism, or perhaps at His Transfiguration, but it seems a far more realistic approach (oversimplified to some, no doubt) to regard such events in Christ's life as events *through which* this filial consciousness was confirmed rather than communicated. In any event, as we have already quoted, we believe that Jesus was 'the Son of God in a peculiar and unique sense: this was how He conceived Himself, and this is fundamentally how we have to conceive Him'.

The other New Testament phrase used to describe Christ is 'the Son of Man.' This is a term which, unlike 'Son of God', is used only by Jesus Himself, and one which has loomed large in theological controversy. The approach of those who deny that Jesus regarded Himself as divine is well known. For one thing, they suggest that Jesus used the term to mean simply 'humanity', and they ground such an assertion on the fact that the Old Testament uses the phrase in this sense—the 8th Psalm, for instance. But a quick reading of the occasions on which Jesus uses the term should be enough to convince us of how unreasonable such an assertion is. Not one of the occasions on which He uses the term leads naturally to that interpretation. A slightly more plausible objection rests on the asumption that when the Gospel writer represents Jesus as using the term it is actually the early Christian community—not Jesus Himself—that is speaking. Quite apart from the fact that this guess casts aspersions on the biblical record, it is to be discounted, we believe, because this term 'Son of Man' was disliked and avoided by the early Christians.

This is not to say that the term originates on Christ's lips; but it is to say that the meaning of the term has undergone a radical transformation in Christ's use of it. When He uses the phrase to describe Himself is He claiming simply to be the personal embodiment of human nature at its best? (This is a tremendous claim in itself, of course, but is this all?) Is He mainly concerned to declare Himself as the representative individual in whose Person the whole race of mankind is 'recapitulated'? Is he setting Himself up as the realised ideal? Yes, He does all this—and all these are important aspects of who Christ is. But Christ deliberately claims to be more than this. When He speaks of Himself as the Son of Man He uses this phrase in a sense that is foreign to the phrase as it occurs originally in the book of Daniel. His healing of the paralytic is performed so that men may 'know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins'. Speaking to the legalistically-minded Pharisees He declares: 'The Son of man is Lord even of the sabbath day.' The question which He put to His disciples at Caesarea Philippi was: 'Whom do men say that I, the Son of man, am?'

In the four Gospel accounts, indeed, there are several dozen

clear assertions by Jesus that He is the 'Son of man'— assertions which make it clear that His understanding of the phrase is much more profound than that of His contemporaries. In fact, by the time of His Incarnation the phrase had already acquired an 'official' sense—it was the term used to describe the coming Messiah. As has sometimes been pointed out, whereas in the book of Daniel we have to do with *a* son of man, in the book of Enoch we are concerned with *the* Son of man. The title has become not only individualised but 'supernaturalised' as well. The Son of man is thought of as a divine being. This is the conception of the term which was widely accepted by the time Jesus began to use it. The Messiah is one who shares the throne of God. To believe that Jesus was not aware of this connotation when He used the phrase 'Son of man' is surely to be rather naïve. As J. K. Mozley has claimed in his *The Doctrine of the Incarnation*, 'only a drastic treatment of the Gospels, which can neither justify itself on literary grounds nor can successfully reconstruct the historical facts to which the Gospels witness, will be equal to the task of showing that Jesus did not believe Himself to be the Messiah'.

In calling Himself the Son of man Jesus quite frankly claimed to be to the human race, and to its hopes, what no one else could be. And linked to this tremendous claim was the recognition that He was the 'Servant'. 'The Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister.' This is the paradox —one of many—that many thinkers cannot accept. It is, indeed, a pointer to the basic christological paradox of the 'two natures.' All the associations which gathered round Isaiah's picture of the servant of Jehovah (his lowly condition, his submission to sufferings on behalf of others, his final exaltation) were blended—certainly in Christ's mind—with the ideas of the Son of man which had become current by the time Christ lived on earth. Christ, indeed, who claimed to be Son of man made it clear that this claim could be vindicated only by the Son of man's readiness to suffer. Among those who reject the fact that Christ made supernatural claims will be found many who refuse to accept this basic paradox. And yet, as the New Testament makes plain, Jesus Himself saw no contradiction between His function as 'Servant' in the present age and 'Son of man' in the coming age. Both spring from His

awareness of His unique relation to God. Indeed, Christ's 'messianic consciousness' must always be interpreted through His 'filial consciousness'—and not the reverse.

For this reason we can easily accept the eschatological element in Christ's awareness of the implications of His title the Son of man, without exaggerating this element. The mission of the 'Son of man' was preparatory to the final judgment which He had the power to make 'in the age to come'. As one writer has observed in *Essays on the Trinity and Incarnation*, 'the right to teach with the authority of God Himself was naturally the one function of the Son of man which Jesus anticipated in the present age. Thus the Enochian Christology provided for Jesus a mode in which He gave expression to the superhuman intuitions of His consciousness.' (p. 41). Christ, indeed, was deeply conscious of the fact that all the issues of His age—and of all ages—were moving to their crisis, *and* that He was 'equal to the occasion'. This is the amazing fact which leaps out at us from the Gospels. He was dealing with men and the world only as God could. 'I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men to Me.' What a stupendous claim! 'As the lightning comes out of the east, and shines even to the west, so also shall the coming of the Son of man be.'

It is obvious, then, that we believe the traditional assessments of the terms 'Son of God' and 'Son of man' to be as valid today as they were before the advent of liberalism and Form Criticism. We cannot 'water down' the claims which Christ made for Himself—except at the expense of a truncated Gospel. It is sometimes said, for instance, that it is sheer mystification to say that Jesus is 'divine', and that He did not actually have to *be* God to bring the authentic revelation of God. But unless He were, in some real sense that goes deeper than the mythology of our terms, God, what guarantee do we have that He does bring the authentic revelation of God? We often hear a plea for the 'simple Gospel' as against a 'complex Christology', but if we make the Gospel too simple we shall find that we have failed to understand its chief import—that it is a message about who God is and what He does. Among the many wise words in Donald M. Baillie's book *God Was In Christ* are these: 'It is vitally important to learn that the real christological question is not simply a psychological or an historical question about

Jesus, as to His psychical constitution, as to how His mind worked, as to His "self-consciousness", and what claims He made; but is fundamentally a question about the nature and activity of God.'

This is the really important element in Christ's many 'claims' as to who He was. Many people secretly (or openly) repudiate the notion of Incarnation, and so do not understand many of Christ's pronouncements about Himself, and about God. But actually the Incarnation is not an additional problem thrown in to confuse our thinking about the nature of God; it is the only real way in which the Christian idea of God can appear worthy of belief. This is why Cyril Valentine reminds us that 'the authority of Christ as revealer of God must depend upon the doctrine of His Person'. Herein lies one of the most striking differences between Christianity and non-Christian religions. Christianity is Christ. But Mohammedanism is not Mohammed. Mohammed made no greater claim than most of the Jewish prophets. The essence of Mohammedanism lies in the message which its sacred book contains. The *person* of the prophet Mohammed has its main importance in the fact that he confirmed the authenticity of the revelation recorded in the book. In a similar way we may compare Christ with Gautama, the founder of Buddhism. Gautama is credited by his followers with discovering (or re-discovering) a way of salvation—a way of gaining freedom from the weary chain of existence, and attaining Nirvana—the final bliss of extinction. But, at his highest, Gautama is but the supreme example of the success of his method. Certainly in his conversation with a disciple, Ananda, Gautama frankly denies the notion that Buddhism is in any sense dependent on him or inseparable from him. It was not the *person* but the *method* which held the promise of salvation.

How different when we consider the relation of Christ to Christianity! He categorically claimed to be the End and Consummator of men's being. He claimed to give men life, and to sustain them by His presence. Now if these claims cannot be substantiated, surely Christianity must destroy itself. What Christ knew Himself to be is of prime importance; there are obvious limitations in attempting to argue back from Christian experience *alone* to what Christ *must* have been. And it must

make a great deal of difference to our Christianity if we believe (as against not believing) that Christ was completely aware that the whole course of God's redemptive purpose had been working through the ages *for Him*. His Person is the centre of Christian doctrine as also of Christian life. He Himself saves us from the idea that God is merely 'like Christ', and insists that God was 'in Christ'.

Now at this point we must acknowledge another objection to our belief in Christ's acceptance of the title 'divine'—an objection made by Harnack and many of the liberal theologians of the nineteenth century, and one which contains enough truth that we should try to 'square' it with what has already been said. It is the assertion not only that God was in Christ but that Christ's Gospel really had to do with God the Father, not with Christ the Son. It might indeed be claimed that there are as many sayings in the New Testament which suggest that Christ did *not* make supernatural claims for Himself, as there are sayings that He did. On the face of it this is certainly true. In fact we are bound to make a statement that will seem, on first hearing, to invalidate much of what we have claimed for Christ, i.e. that the most remarkable fact about Jesus is not His 'self-consciousness' but His God-consciousness. He thinks far more about God than He does of Himself. However valid may be the idea of Christ's 'messianic self-consciousness' (and we believe it *has* validity), what is most remarkable about Christ is not His self-consciousness but His *God*-consciousness.

It is clear that in the New Testament Jesus is continually pointing beyond Himself to the Father. In the matter of His healing 'miracles' He almost invariably asks men to give the glory to God. In the matter of His own 'goodness' He repudiated the very suggestion that He had it independently of God. 'Jesus said unto him, Why callest thou Me good? There is none good but one, that is, God.' But let us note that this is *not* mere self-depreciation (as those who deny Christ's claim to divinity would have us believe); rather is it the absence of that distasteful self-consciousness which illustrates a man's preoccupation with his own worth. The fact is that in the Person of Christ we have a profound paradox. It might even be expressed in the words: 'I, yet not I, but God.' It is seen in the statement: 'I can of mine own self do nothing: as I hear, I

judge: and my judgment is just, because I seek not mine own will but the will of the Father who has sent me' (John 5.30). Or again: 'I have not spoken of Myself; but the Father who sent me gave a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak' (John 12.49). Now clearly these statements do not contain simply a disclaimer. They enshrine a unique claim and an humble disclaimer *at the same time*. In short, the higher and the more 'outrageous' Christ's claims become, the more they have reference to God the Father. As Dr Karl Barth has often reminded us, the phrase 'the holiness of Jesus' means basically that He did not treat His own goodness as an independent thing. Indeed, the God-Man is the only man who claims nothing for self and all for God—and this is precisely the 'proof' that His highest claims for self are justified. It may be said further that *all* His claims, *both* His claims to be 'equal with God' *and* His insistence on a 'subordinate' role, demonstrate His uniqueness, since (as has been suggested) holiness means the ability not to treat one's goodness as independent of Him who is Good.

It is this essential insight which Harnack and his followers have missed. In saying that the original Gospel teaching of Jesus concerned the Father, not the Son, they did much to counteract the tendency towards a 'Jesus cult'—a cult which is by no means dead today. But they did this at the expense of one strand of the Gospel story—the strand which leaves no doubt but that Jesus knew His unique relationship with God. The New Testament is christological from the very beginning —and the essence of this Christology is the paradox of Him who is sure of His Sonship and aware of His mission to 'show us the Father'.

A biblically based theology, therefore, must refute the assertion of Dean Rashdall that Jesus did not claim an exclusive divinity. 'Never (writes the Dean) is there in any critically well-attested sayings anything which suggests that His conscious relation to God was other than that of a man towards God—the attitude which He wished that all men should adopt towards God.' Christ's whole ministry gives the lie to this! However we may interpret the miracles they are clearly 'moral acts of power which bear witness to the new era which has broken in with the coming of Jesus'. Jesus knew He was acting 'as

God'. He Himself insists that Christology is not an extra! A true dogmatic must be christologically determined. Unless the Church is fully aware of who *He* is, how can it understand fully what God wants to say to men? The question: 'Who does He think He is?' is the most basic question of all. As Donald Baillie has remarked: the question 'Who is He?' is *the same as* 'What part does God take in all this?'

Is this not why we must go beyond the idea of Jesus 'discovering' God for men, and speak of 'incarnation'? To insist on this has become more and more urgent with the passing years. How common, and how erroneous, for example, is the view expressed by G. Bullett in his *Problems of Religion*: 'If it could be established beyond possibility of doubt that Jesus had never existed, the shock to Christendom and the distress of individual Christians would be great, but the vital core of Christianity would be unimpaired.' What could be more shallow than this! If Christ is *not* God Incarnate, then the Gospel's message about the nature of God is a message little different from that of many religions. It is only through Christ's relationship to God that we can know the true nature of this God. If Christ's claimed awareness of His unique Sonship is a deception, so is the whole Gospel. As Cyril Valentine has well said: 'In Him . . . there is found not only the absence of those conditions which might vitiate, however slightly, His explanations of the nature of reality; there is also found to be present that perfect and immediate communion of a full personality with the Personality of God; and such communion alone could give sure understanding of the nature of the object of personal experience' (op. cit., p. 194). This, assuredly, has been the orthodox Christian conviction for many centuries, and it seems unlikely that either the aggressiveness of much modern science or the scepticism of much modern theology will succeed in reversing that conviction. 'The stupendous claim,' writes Dr J. S. Whale in his *Christian Doctrine*, 'that the Son of Man is the Son of God goes back indubitably to Christ Himself. . . . The Christology of the New Testament is no mere *Gemeindetheologie*—the wishful thinking of enthusiasts with little historic sense, a fantastic tune whistled by disillusioned fanatics to keep their courage up.' How many in Christendom today should be praying: 'Lord, I believe; help Thou mine unbelief'!

THE TRINITARIAN THEOLOGY OF AUGUSTINE AND HIS DEBT TO PLOTINUS

by The Rev. Professor THOMAS A. WASSMER

A very powerful case has been made out for the influence of the Platonism of Plotinus upon Saint Augustine. From the Manichaean simple solution of the problem of evil Augustine was delivered by reading the neo-Platonists and especially Plotinus. It was Plotinus who convinced him that God was a spirit, not a luminous body, and he always remained grateful for this deliverance from the crude fantasies of the Manichaeans. In the two years before his conversion when he was receiving a deeper penetration into Christianity through the sermons of St. Ambrose, he came to know of Plotinus in a very few treatises of the *Enneads* (certainly I, 6 'On the Beautiful' and quite probably V, 1 'On the Three Chief Hypostases') in the Latin translation of Marius Victorinus. St. Ambrose made a determined effort to apply the principles of Plotinus' philosophy to the clarification of the Christian doctrine of the Trinity as against the Arians. The results of such an attempt might not be theologically satisfying but they are interesting. This impact of the mind of Plotinus upon the mind of Augustine was a decisive one because Augustine found a very great area of agreement between the teaching of Plotinus and that of the Scriptures as expounded by St. Ambrose, above all the Gospel of St. John. It was their agreement that God is spirit and altogether immaterial, as Plotinus explains, which liberated him from the Manichaean materialism. Augustine thought that Plotinus' teaching about the Divine Mind was identical with that of St. John about the Divine Logos. Shortly after his conversion, and some think probably at the actual time, he was clearly conscious of certain fundamental differences between Plotinian neo-Platonism and Christianity. He explains the differences and resemblances as he came to see them in the *Confessiones*, book VII, chapter 9, which together with chapters 10 and 20 of the same book gives a remarkable view of the relationship between his own thought and that of Plotinus.

He always was willing to admit the great measure of agreement between himself and Plotinus but the influence was always within the clearly defined limits established by the Scriptures interpreted by Catholic tradition. Let us consider this most interesting question of the debt that Augustine owes to Plotinus.

Augustine never ceases to stress the Unity of God as the transcendent principle of all order and number and so of being. This emphasis derives from Plotinus because to be anything other than Absolute Unity is to be an ordered whole of parts and so in some sense a unity. Still, in stressing the Unity he equally affirms the Being and the Trinity of God. In considering the Trinity-in-Unity he lays the emphasis on the Unity of the Godhead and not, as the Cappadocian Fathers and the later East, on the Three Divine Persons. Augustine starts from the one and simple divine nature which is the Trinity:

Unus quippe Deus est ipsa Trinitas, et sic unus Deus quomodo unus creator.[1]

This one God is Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Subordinationism is thus rejected because all that is said of God is also said of each and every one of the Persons who are this God.[2] For Augustine all true thinking begins and ends with the Trinity. Thus it is only as Trinity that God creates us and only as Trinity that we can approach Him. The Three Persons have *ad extra* only one will and operation: '*Ubi nulla naturarum nulla est diversitas voluntatum.*'[3] In this very connexion Augustine even altered the theory of theophanies which had been advanced by his predecessors. It is not the Word alone who appeared, but the whole Trinity, God; and He did so, not by Himself, but by means of angels who spoke and acted in His name, who manifested themselves to man in a sensible form.[4] Each one of these three Persons is just as much as the other two Persons: '*Tantus est solus Pater, vel solus Filius, vel solus Spiritus Sanctus quantus est simul Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus.*'[5] This is circumincession: '*semper in invicem, neuter solus*'.[6] Again, the act, which in the Son's Incarnation, has united the Son to the human nature, thus sending Him into the world, is common to the whole Trinity.[7] Augustine tells us that all that refers to the nature

[1] *Contra sermon. arian.*, 3.
[2] *De Trinitate*, V, 9.
[3] *Contra Maximinum*, II, 10, 2; *De Trinitate*, II, 9; *Enchiridion*, XXXVIII.
[4] *De Trinitate*, II, 12ff; III, 22-27.
[5] *De Trinitate*, VI, 9.
[6] *De Trinitate*, VI, 9, 8; XV, 8.
[7] *De Trinitate*, II, 8, 9.

and expresses something absolute must be worded in the singular, since the divine nature, the subject of that absolute, is one.[1]

Certainly the idea of Absolute Likeness by which things are made like, as they are made beautiful by Absolute Beauty, is taken over from Platonism. Once again, Plotinus' thought is very closely approached by Augustine's theology and all orthodox theology in the insistence on God's absolute self-sufficiency, on the completeness and self-containedness of His inner life of love and knowledge and its absolute primacy over the external activity of creation. For Christian theologians and even for Plotinus, an inwardly-turned love and contemplation is the essential divine activity and all God's actions on the creatures He calls into being are secondary. But for Christian theologians creation is not the automatic reflex action that follows the divine contemplation (as it is for Plotinus). Creation is an absolutely free and generous act of the Divine Will. God is not compelled by any necessity to create. The Divine productivity is perfectly expressed by the Eternal Son. Creation and still more Redemption are extra and spontaneous flowerings of the single great stream of will and love with which God wills and loves Himself. From all eternity God bore within Himself the archetypes and plan of creatures and of the world.[2] St. Augustine applies verses 3 and 4 of the first chapter of St. John's Gospel, which he combined in this way: '*Quod factum est in ipso vita erat*'; all that was made was life in the Word, lived in Him, by the Idea He had of it.[3] Here again St. Augustine would depart from Plotinus in maintaining that we can only make such an approach to an understanding of God's inturned love and contemplation as is possible to us when we realise that He is three Persons in One, and that His Unity is not the bare negation of multiplicity of Plotinus' thought at its most negative. Certainly the approach that Augustine had himself made to God in the religious experience of the vision of Ostia was of a much higher order and much more than the philosophical excursus toward the Plotinian 'One'. We have a remarkable study of the distinction between the approach to God of

[1] *De Trinitate*, V, 9, 11.
[2] *De divers. quaest.*, LXXXIII, qu. XLVI, 2.
[3] *De Genesi ad litt.*, V, 33.

Augustine and the contemplation of Plotinus in the definitive study of the Plotinian scholar, Fr. Henry.[1]

Augustine was always convinced of the absolute dependence of man upon God and in this he realised how weak he himself was in seeing the truth or acting rightly when he had seen it by his own strength. Here he departed from Plotinus because Plotinus, like all the Greeks, held that the philosopher could and must act virtucusly, purify his life, know the truth and ascend even to the threshold of the final vision or union by his own strength and without any special divine help. The Christian faith and in particular St. Paul taught Augustine to look elsewhere for the answer to his desperate condition. The absolute conviction of the transcendence of God and the insufficiency of all things created, their inability even to exist without God's sustaining presence, and above all of the utter helplessness of fallen man if left to himself is the deepest principle of Augustine's thought. We realise this principle is at work in his account of the creation, in his theory of knowledge, and in that doctrine of the good life, of the way of return of the redeemed soul to God, which is the centre of his teaching and the terminus to which it is directed. This is so remarkably displayed in the *De Civitate Dei*, VII, 30, and in the *De Genesi ad litt.*, IV, 23.

It is in the doctrine of relations in the Trinity that we have the peculiar contribution of Augustine to Trinitarian theology and the principal departures from Plotinus. Since Augustine has affirmed at the very beginning of his Trinitarian explanation that God is strictly one, the principal difficulty was to avoid modalism and account for the real plurality of Persons. We are introduced to the concept of relations and told that the Persons are relations and relations that are not identified with the substance or the nature since they are not something absolute. On the other hand these relations are not accidents because they are essential to the nature and like it eternal and necessary:

Non secundum substantiam haec dicuntur quia non quisque eorum ad seipsum, sed ad invicem atque ad alterutrum ista dicuntur: neque secundum

[1] 'Augustine and Plotinus', *Journal of Theological Studies*, XXXVIII (1937), 1-23. There is a much longer study of this most interesting question in Fr Henry's longer work, *La Vision d'Ostie*, Vrin, Paris, 1938.

accidens, quia et quod dicitur Pater et quod dicitur Filius aeternum atque incommutabile est. . . . Haec non secundum substantiam dicuntur, sed secundum relativum; quod tamen relativum non est accidens, quia non est mutabile.[1]

Thus the Father is called such *ad Filium*, the Son, *ad Patrem*, and the Holy Ghost, *ad Patrem et Filium*. As to the term person, it has been used in the Trinitarian language, for lack of a better term, to designate *three distinct objects*; but like all other terms, it must be understood of God analogically: '*Tres utique sunt. . . . Tamen cum quaeritur quid tres, magna prorsus inopia humanum laborat eloquium. Dictum est tamen tres personae, non ut illud diceretur, sed ne taceretur.*'[2]

There is surely a very great departure from the emanation of Plotinus when we consider the generation of the Son. In the explanation of the generation of the Son he is following the regular Christian tradition. However, when considering the Holy Ghost it is well to advert that St. Augustine was the first to teach distinctly the procession of the Holy Ghost *a Filio* and to show why he held that doctrine: '*Non possumus dicere quod Spiritus Sanctus et a Filio non procedat: neque enim frustra idem Spiritus et Patris et Filii Spiritus dicitur.*'[3] The production of the Holy Ghost is common to the Father and to the Son and in this respect it resembles the act of creation which is common to the three Persons. The Father and the Son are but one Principle of the Holy Ghost: '*Fatendum est Patrem et Filium principium esse Spiritus Sancti, non duo principia.*'[4] It might be said that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father *principaliter*, because it is the Father who imparts to the Son, together with His substance, the power to produce the Holy Ghost.[5] St. Augustine admits that he cannot answer the question as to the intimate nature of this procession and in what it differs from the generation of the Son. Only in heaven shall we know the answer.[6]

The Divine Persons are, then, relations, and all that does not signify a relation in God is common to them. The Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost are *Wisdom*, although this word is

[1] *De Trinitate*, V, 6, 16, 17; VII, 24. Cf. *De Civitate Dei*, XI, 10, 1.
[2] *De Trinitate*, V, 10; VII, 8, 9.
[3] *De Trinitate*, IV, 29; *Contra Maximinum*, II, 14, 1; *In Joannem tractatus*, XCIV, 7.
[4] *De Trinitate*, V, 15.
[5] *De Trinitate*, XV, 29; cf. 47, 48.
[6] *De Trinitate*, XV, 45; cf. IX, 17, 18.

used especially of the Son. Likewise, they are *Love*, although this title becomes more especially the Holy Ghost.[1]

In this entire pyschological approach to the Trinity St. Augustine certainly advanced beyond the inheritance he received from others. He surpasses them all when he turns to the created world in search of analogies of the Trinity. It is true that Victorinus had given some indications of this but St. Augustine developed the subject and truly prepared the way for the later Scholastic speculations. Seven books of the *De Trinitate* (IX-XV) are devoted to the development of this theme. The author finds the image of the Blessed Trinity in the human soul which knows itself and loves itself: *mens, notitia, amor.* '*Haec tria unum atque una substantia*' (IX, 18); in the memory, intelligence and will (X); in the object that is seen, the vision and the attention of the one who sees (XI); in the understanding of the teachings of the faith, the memory we keep of them and the effort we make to recall them (XIII); finally, in the memory, knowledge, and love of God, for it is chiefly then that the soul, which is God's natural likeness because of its three faculties of memory, intelligence and will, becomes still more His likeness by the thought of God who lives in it (XIV).

It is because Augustine realises full well the inadequacy of all the psychological trinities, as images of the highest Trinity, that he does not attempt in book XV a cut-and-dried exposition of the doctrine of the nature of the Triune God. His work is not a text-book in dogmatic theology but an exercise in the method of intellectual contemplation which finds its climax in the celestial vision of the eternal, incorporeal, and immutable things of God. '*Iam ergo in ipsis rebus aeternis, incorporalibus et incomutabilibus, in quarum perfecta contemplatione nobis beata, quae nonnisi aeterna est, vita promittitur, Trinitatem quae Deus est inquiramus.*'[2] Therefore Grabmann believes that the theology of the *De Trinitate* culminates in a mysticism which is characteristic not only of the personal thought of St. Augustine but of all medieval Catholic mysticism.

Augustine's concentration upon the inner spiritual reality of God and his direction away from the external, material world

[1] *De Trinitate*, VII, 1-4; XV, 27-37.
[2] *De Trinitate*, XV, 4, 6; col. 1061.

is manifest in his consideration of the forms in matter to be nothing but the likenesses of the Divine Ideas and traces of God (*vestigia*). We see the same in Plotinus who considered the forms to be '*indalmata*', the last and lowest appearances of spiritual reality. Certainly, when we study God in His relation to the created world we can understand how strongly influenced Augustine was in his description of the *rationes aeternae* by the Platonic theory of Ideas, and by Plotinus' doctrine that the first emanation contains the intelligible principles (*logoi*) of all things.[1] We know that Augustine accepted the Platonic theory of Ideas with the qualification that has become characteristic of Christian Platonism, viz. that these Ideas reside in the mind of God.

Augustine himself believed that no other Greek school of philosophy offered such possibilities for the approach to the God of Christianity. In the *De Civitate Dei* (VIII, 5; I, 330A), after a short but accurate summary of pre-Platonic philosophy in Greece, Augustine affirms again the judgment of his earlier works: Plato was the best of the ancient philosophers and most nearly approached the Christian concept of God. Contrasted with the materialism of the later Epicureans or Stoics, the Platonic approach to the human soul and to God is infinitely preferable. We might say that this very high esteem for the position of Plato which includes the neo-Platonism of Plotinus is expressed in terms of his own metaphysics:

> Let all these thinkers give way, then, as we have said, to the Platonists. Even let those give way, who have been ashamed to say that God is a body but who have thought that our souls are of the same nature as God. The great mutability of the soul, which is wrongly attributed to the nature of God, has not deterred them in this. Rather, they say: the nature of the soul is changed by the body, though in itself the soul is unchangeable. This is like saying: flesh is wounded by some kind of body, though in itself flesh cannot be wounded. The fact of the matter is, that an immutable thing cannot be changed by anything, and the fact that a thing can be changed by a body shows that it can be changed by something, and therefore cannot rightly be called immutable.[2]

It is interesting to advert to the defence that Augustine makes of Plotinus in the tenth book of the *De Civitate Dei* when he is considering the question of demonolatry as en-

[1] *Enneades*, IV, 4, 16.
[2] *De Civitate Dei*, VIII, 5; I, pp. 332-3H.

couraged by the neo-Platonic theologians. Augustine says that this would attribute *latria* to someone other than God and such an error is opposed not only to Christianity but is incompatible with the principles of Plotinus. Plotinus held that God is the intelligible light of the human soul, and that the intellectual creature has no superior save God.[1] Augustine in his praise of Plotinus even goes so far as to say that, on this point, Plotinus was in agreement with (*consonans evangelio*) the famous Gospel of St. John, in which the true light of man is held to be the Christ-God. However, the followers of Plotinus perverted and distorted his philosophy. What greater respect could be shown?

The transmutation of Plotinus' theology by Augustine will always remain for philosophers the remarkable example of grace working in history. Deeper research only reveals all the more the consistent, constant presence of God in history.

[1] *De Civitate Dei*, X, 2; I, 406B-C.

THE DATE AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE LAST SUPPER

by The Rev. A. GILMORE

The date, nature and significance of the Last Supper has long been a living issue in biblical scholarship, but the issues have taken on a new importance in recent years, due mainly to some of the writings of Mlle A. Jaubert,[1] who has been working on the Dead Sea Scrolls and whose discoveries go further towards the solution of this problem than anything previously discovered. It is unfortunate, however, that her writings have not been translated into English and have therefore not been widely noticed in this country.[2] What we propose to do in this paper is first, to outline again the problem, drawing attention to the main contributions that have been made in recent years; second, to estimate the significance of the problem; and third, to summarise the contribution made by Mlle Jaubert.

1. The Problem

Two of the best and most recent statements of the problem in English are those by V. Taylor[3] and A. J. B. Higgins,[4] though we must not overlook the oustanding contribution made by J. Jeremias,[5] of which there is now an English translation. The problem arises because according to the Synoptic writers the Last Supper which Jesus held with His disciples in the upper room was a Passover meal; it took place on 15th Nisan which in the year of crucifixion would be Thursday evening. According to the Fourth Gospel, however, Jesus was killed on 14th Nisan, when the paschal lambs were being sacrificed in the temple; that would mean that the Last Supper took place on the previous evening (the beginning of

[1] 'La date de la dernière Cène', in *Revue de l'histoire des Religions*, cxlvi (1954), 140ff, and *La Date de la Cène*.

[2] For a review of her arguments, cf. J. Jeremias, *J.T.S.*, 10 (1959), 131ff, and for an English summary cf. M. Black, 'The Arrest and Trial of Jesus and the Date of the Last Supper', in *New Testament Essays. Studies in Memory of T. W. Manson*, 19ff.

[3] *The Gospel According to St. Mark*, 664-7.

[4] *The Lord's Supper in the New Testament*, 13-23.

[5] *Die Abendmahlsworte Jesu*, E.T. *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*.

14th Nisan) and that the Passover would not be eaten until the next evening (the beginning of 15th Nisan).

To both points of view objections, some of them powerful objections, have been raised. Against the Synoptic account, for example, it is argued that we are here presented with a picture which is not consistent with itself. Some of the events described, it is maintained, could not possibly have taken place on the festival day of 15th Nisan. These include the journey to Gethsemane, the carrying of arms, the meeting of the Sanhedrin and the condemnation to death, the coming of Simon of Cyrene ἀπ' ἀγροῦ (Mark 15.21; Luke 23.26), the purchase of the linen and the preparation of spices and ointments.[1] Furthermore, the word that is used for bread is the word for ordinary bread (ἄρτος) and not the word for unleavened bread (ἄζυμα) whilst no mention is made of the paschal lamb or the bitter herbs which would have been a necessary part of the Passover meal. These and other objections, therefore, make it very difficult to believe that the Synoptic picture of the Last Supper as a Passover meal is a reliable one.

On the other hand, the picture contained in the Fourth Gospel, though inherently more consistent, is nevertheless open to equally serious objection on other grounds. Against this view, for example, it is maintained that the writer was more interested in theology than in chronology and that consequently it suited his purpose to synchronise the crucifixion with the time when the paschal lambs were being slain in the temple.[2] Moreover, if the Last Supper were not a Passover meal, what kind of meal was it?

Those who uphold the Johannine view have made many attempts to answer this question and three specific answers have been offered. Some[3] have maintained that the Last

[1] These and other points are listed in V. Taylor, *The Gospel According to St. Mark*, 666, and answers to some of them are provided in A. J. B. Higgins, op. cit., 17ff.

[2] H. H. Rowley (*The Re-discovery of the Old Testament*, 213) says there is no reason at all to account for the Synoptists' interpretation if it were unhistorical, and A. J. B. Higgins, in a recent re-assessment of the situation ('The Origins of the Eucharist', in *N.T.S.*, 1 (1954-5), 200-9), is confirmed in his previous acceptance of the Synoptic picture partly on these grounds.

[3] G. H. Box ('The Jewish Antecedents of the Eucharist', in *J.T.S.*, 3 (1902), 357-69) argued that it was a sabbath *kiddush* and W. O. E. Oesterley (*The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy*, 167ff) that it was a Passover *kiddush*.

Supper was a *kiddush*, a prayer of sanctification said over a cup of wine by the head of the household at the beginning of the sabbath and at the beginning of the festival, but the difficulty with this interpretation is that the *kiddush* always preceded the actual celebration of the day and would never be held twenty-four hours earlier as here.

Others, secondly, have suggested that the Last Supper was a *haburah*, a gathering of friends to celebrate a religious meal, but C. W. Dugmore[1] has criticised this view on the grounds that a *haburah* was a voluntary association of those who definitely pledged themselves to separate their tithes in accordance with Torah and also to maintain the laws of clean and unclean laid down in the Torah, and that therefore the term cannot be correctly applied to our Lord and his disciples.

Thirdly, there have been put forward other solutions some of which attempt to take a middle course. Theo Preiss,[2] for instance, followed by V. Taylor,[3] takes the view that Jesus intended to celebrate the Passover with His disciples but realised that it would not be possible and so partook of a meal which was not the Passover but which nevertheless had a paschal character one day earlier than He would have wished. This view has not been generally accepted and A. J. B. Higgins[4] describes it as quite unconvincing. Neville Clark,[5] taking a slightly different line, maintains that the exponents of the *haburah* theory have overplayed their hand but believes that the origins of the Last Supper lie nevertheless in an ordinary meal. G. D. Kilpatrick[6] has related the Last Supper to a religious meal referred to in *Joseph and Asenath*,[7] pointing out the differences and the similarities, but concluding that the meal referred to in this document is a real alternative to the Passover interpretation of Jeremias and others. To this, Jeremias[8] has replied to the effect that it is difficult to imagine that such a religious rite existed without having left a trace

[1] In a review of G. Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, in *J.T.S.*, 47 (1946), 108.
[2] 'Le dernier repas de Jésus fut-il un repas pascal?' in *Theologische Zeitschrift*, iv (1948), 81-101.
[3] *The Life and Ministry of Jesus*, 190ff; *Jesus and His Sacrifice*, 114ff.
[4] op. cit., 16.
[5] *An Approach to the Theology of the Sacraments*, 47f. For a criticism of this argument, see A. J. B. Higgins in *S.J.T.*, 10 (1957), 210.
[6] 'The Last Supper', in *E.T.*, lxiv (1952-3), 4-8.
[7] English translation by E. W. Brooks, *The Book of Joseph and Asenath* (S.P.C.K.).
[8] 'The Last Supper', in *E.T.*, lxiv (1952-3), 91-92.

anywhere else, and he prefers to think that this document is speaking of the benedictions at the beginning and at the end of the ordinary daily meal, and of the anointing of the guest before the meal. The discussion does not appear to have been developed further.

From all this, it will be clear to all that the problem is a somewhat complicated one and that a good deal of evidence and argument can be produced both for and against the idea that the Last Supper was a Passover meal. Some notable attempts[1] have been made to try to reconcile one account with the other, but on the whole none of them can claim much of a following and to deal with them at this juncture would serve only to complicate matters still further as well as to turn our attention from our major concern. We may therefore conclude, with certain eminent scholars, that the Synoptic and Johannine pictures cannot be reconciled and it will be necessary for us to decide between them.[2]

In general the tendency among British scholars has been to prefer the Johannine record to that of the Synoptists but the work of Jeremias has re-opened the subject in recent years and A J. B. Higgins and H. H. Rowley[3] now both favour the Passover interpretation. We should therefore be wise to read with caution such remarks as that of A. M. Hunter[4] that the commonest view among scholars is that the Last Supper was a *kiddush*, and to accept rather the wisdom of C. E. B. Cranfield[5] when he says that the tendency of some British scholars to assume that the question has been settled that way is premature.

By this stage, however, the man with a practical turn of mind will be questioning the value and importance of all this, and so we must turn to our second main section.

[1] J. Jeremias ('The Last Supper', in *J.T.S.* (1949), 50, 1-10) and V. Taylor (*The Gospel According to St. Mark*, 665) refer to Billerbeck's argument about the discrepancy between Pharisaic and Sadducaic calendars and to the difficulty in determining the first day of the month.

[2] V. Taylor, *The Life and Ministry of Jesus*, 190ff. A. J. B. Higgins ('The Origins of the Eucharist', in *N.T.S.*, 1 (1954-5), 200-9) has more recently re-examined the relationships between John and the Synoptics, and also the alternative explanations of the nature of the meal that have been offered, but still reaffirms his previous position.

[3] *The Re-discovery of the Old Testament*, 213.

[4] *The Work and Words of Jesus*, 116.

[5] 'Thank', in A. Richardson (ed.), *A Theological Word Book of the Bible*, 255.

2. The Significance

Some writers have dealt with the significance of this kind of scholarship in a somewhat cavalier fashion. Accepting the fact that no solution has been reached, and that on the existing evidence it would appear that no solution can be reached, they have tended to say that it does not matter. F. J. Leenhardt,[1] for instance, says that the paschal interpretation of the Last Supper does not seem to him to depend directly on the solution of the chronological problem, and V. Taylor,[2] whilst granting that these chronological problems are of great interest and importance, points out that they may be exaggerated; whether the Last Supper was a Passover meal or not, he says, paschal ideas and associations must have occupied the mind of Jesus on this occasion. C. F. D. Moule,[3] similarly, says that in the end this particular problem is not of great moment theologically, since on either dating the Eucharist is paschal in its associations, and he quotes Dom Gregory Dix (*Jew and Greek*, 101) with approval, when he said, 'The *whole sequence* Supper, Crucifixion, and Resurrection, took place for the apostles upon the background of Passover.'

All this, of course, is true, and in the absence of any conclusive evidence it is an excellent way of dealing with the problem. On the one hand it ensures that the full significance of the Passover is brought to bear on our interpretation of the Last Supper and on the other hand it delivers us from misinterpreting the Last Supper by trying to relate it to meals and ceremonies with which it had no connexion. At the same time, nobody can deny the fact that if it could be satisfactorily shown that the Last Supper was a Passover meal, our knowledge and interpretation of it would benefit immensely. Jeremias[4] says that the issue is not only one of archeological or chronological interest; rather it is of the highest importance for the true understanding of the method of our salvation; if the Last Supper was a Passover meal, the connexion between the old and the new

[1] *Le Sacrement de la Sainte Cène*, 14 (quoted by H. H. Rowley, *The Unity of the Bible*, 112n).

[2] *Jesus and His Sacrifice*, 114ff, 181. Cf. F. J. Taylor, 'Passover', in A. Richardson (ed.), op. cit., 163f.

[3] 'J. Jeremias, "The Parables of Jesus" and "The Eucharistic Words of Jesus" ' in *E.T.*, lxvi (1954-5), 46-50.

[4] 'The Last Supper', in *J.T.S.*, 50 (1949), 7.

covenant, between promise and fulfilment, is seen in a new light. He even goes so far as to say that the Lord's utterances at the Last Supper are only to be understood in this light.

Our next task, then, is to understand how far our interpretation of the Last Supper would be helped if it could be shown conclusively to have been a celebration of the Passover. It seems to the present writer that it would help in three ways.

First, it would bring together promise and fulfilment[1] and would underline the unity of Old and New Testaments in a way that would be thoroughly consistent with modern biblical scholarship.[2] A. M. Hunter,[3] for example, points out that the Passover commemorated the great act of God which led to the first exodus and to Israel's being marked out as a special people by a covenant at Sinai sealed with blood. Jesus, however, is concerned with the creation of a new Israel and with the establishment of a new covenant. This covenant, like the old, is to be ratified in sacrifice and the shedding of blood. And it gives a wholeness to the picture if both arise out of the same feast, the Passover. Just as the Hebrews gathered after the Passover at Sinai and were constituted into a people, so the Twelve gathered after the Passover in the upper room and were also constituted into a people.

F. J. Taylor[4] adds further similarities and comparisons. In the early centuries both feasts, he maintains, pointed to a definite state and event in history; both commemorated an act of deliverance; both were followed by a covenant, sealed by sacrificial blood; and both required a pledge of loyalty to God every time they were repeated. And even N. Clark,[5] whose whole argument points against a Passover interpretation of the Last Supper, nevertheless has to admit that the Passover interpretation is relevant on this ground of the wholeness of the biblical revelation. As the Jewish Passover stood between the Exodus-Sinai deliverance and the messianic age, he says, so the Eucharist stands between the passion-resurrection and the parousia, and he adds in a footnote that this is the point

[1] J. Jeremias, op. cit., 7.
[2] For the attitude of Christ to the Old Testament, see C. H. Dodd, *The Old Testament in the New* and J. G. S. S. Thomson, 'Christ and the Old Testament', in *E.T.*, lxvii (1955-6), 18ff.
[3] *Introducing New Testament Theology*, 20off, 36.
[4] op. cit., 163f.
[5] op. cit., 41ff.

at which the Passover background becomes relevant for the understanding of the Last Supper.[1]

Such parallels and similarities between the two rites, if they occurred in two separate and quite distinct documents, need mean nothing at all. But occurring, as they do, in two documents that are noted for their unity of thought and outlook, and where the first is held by general consent to look forward to the second, and the second is held to fulfil the first, it is difficult to resist the conclusion that it is as a Passover that the Last Supper ought to be seen, for only in that way can this wholeness be preserved at this point.

Secondly, if this unity of thought could be proven at this point, and if the Last Supper could be shown to be a Passover, then what we know of the Passover would enable us to some extent to preserve a right emphasis in our eucharistic doctrine. H. H. Rowley,[2] for instance, points out that the Passover was a memorial, not of the slaughter of the lambs, but of the deliverance that followed it; similarly, he argues, the Eucharist is a memorial not so much of the Last Supper, as of the deliverance that followed it. Such a distinction, if it could be pressed, would be a most valuable asset in avoiding an overemphasis on the elements and the liturgy rather than on the fact that lay behind them. There is here also the further possibility that a careful study of the Last Supper in the light of the Passover would lead to new conceptions and interpretations.

Thirdly, a clear-cut relationship between the Passover and the Last Supper would help us to a fuller understanding of the words of Jesus at the Last Supper.

It would help to solve the difficulty that some scholars feel concerning the phrases 'my blood of the covenant' (Mark 14.24) and 'the new covenant in my blood' (1 Cor. 11.25). A. J. B. Higgins[3] examines the matter and concludes that the words 'of the covenant' form no part of the original tradition of this saying of Jesus. There is no evidence in fact that at His last meal with His disciples Jesus said anything about a covenant at all, though he is careful to add that this is not to

[1] A. J. B. Higgins, in a review (*S.J.T.*, 10 (1957), 210), regrets that Clark makes no more of this idea.

[2] *The Re-discovery of the Old Testament*, 213.

[3] op. cit., 29ff. Cf. J. Jeremias, op. cit., 7.

say that the *idea* of a covenant as foretold by Jeremiah, was not present in His mind. Paul was probably the first to make explicit this notion which was implicit in the tradition he had received. But if it was commonly acknowledged that what Jesus ate with His disciples on that night was in fact the Passover, there would be no need for lengthy explanations on the part of Jesus. Such explanations would only be necessary at a later date when the Passover tradition was in doubt or in danger of being forgotten, and would explain perfectly why later traditions felt called upon to make explicit what the Church herself knew to be implicit.

It would help further towards our understanding of the idea of remembrance. Some scholars have found difficulty with the omission in Mark of the double command to repeat the Last Supper 'in remembrance of me', and have again concluded that Paul's introduction of it (1 Cor. 11.24f) is but a making explicit what everybody took to be implicit. And this again would be precisely what one would expect if the Last Supper were known to have been a celebration of the Passover. In the Passover the idea of remembrance was central (Exod. 12.14; 13.3, 9; Deut. 16.3), and it would only be necessary to draw attention to it when Gentiles were being admitted to the Church and when the dust was gathering on the ancient Judaism so that familiarity with the essential characteristics of the Passover were less well known. Jacob J. Petuchowski[1] throws further light on this with his suggestion that within Judaism itself the symbolical Passover foods, whatever their original significance, lent themselves to associations with the memory of persons, so that when they are eaten it is done 'in remembrance of . . .'.

Furthermore, any tendency to regard the Last Supper as a mere 'memorial' would be corrected if the relationship with the Passover could be satisfactorily maintained, for the Passover was not simply an occasion when Israel looked back to the moment of her deliverance; it was, even more, an occasion of expectant joy when she looked forward to the consummation of the people of God. So too the Eucharist, on this interpretation, would be delivered from too much emphasis on the

[1] '"Do This in Remembrance of Me" (1 Cor. 11.24)', in *J.B.L.*, lxxvi (1957), 293-8.

past by a proper looking forward to its eschatological fulfilment in the kingdom of God.

Finally, A. J. B. Higgins[1] shows how the phrases 'This is my body' and 'This is my blood' (Mark 14.22, 24) are only fully intelligible if a Passover background may be assumed, for in that case the disciples would doubtless have received some preparation for, and explanation of, the phrases, probably during the Passover *Haggadah*. Such an assumption, if correct, would further ensure a right emphasis in the Eucharist, because the real significance of the Passover lambs was not that they had any efficacy in themselves but that they *represented* the efficacious death of the lambs in Egypt; so also, it could then be argued, the bread and the wine of the Eucharist possess no efficacy of themselves, but rather *represent* the atoning sacrifice of Christ as the true paschal lamb.

Our conclusion, therefore, is that if it could be shown that the Last Supper was a Passover the chief benefits would be three. First, it would preserve the wholeness of the revelation and the unity of the old and new covenant ; second, it would indicate possible lines of interpretations and safeguards in our understanding of the Eucharist; third, it would lead to a new appreciation of the sayings of Jesus on this occasion. What we have to do now is to see how much recent research and discovery have contributed towards the solution of this problem.

3. The Recent Contribution

It is necessary first to return to the controversy with which we started between John and the Synoptics concerning the dating of the Last Supper. When we do so we discover that the problem is wider; it concerns the dating, not only of the Last Supper, but also of certain other events in Holy Week, and the chief problem presented by the Synoptics is that of getting all the events between the Last Supper and the crucifixion in one night.[2] Notice the list: Jesus is brought before the high priest; the chief priests, the elders and the scribes are all assembled (Mark 14.53), as is the whole Sanhedrin (Mark

[1] op. cit., 49ff.

[2] Cf. A. Jaubert, 'La date de la dernière Cène', in *Revue de l'histoire des Religions*, cxlvi (1954), 140-73. Also E. Vogt, 'Antiquum Kalendarium Sacerdotale' and 'Dies Ultimae Coenae Domini', in *Biblica*, 36 (1955), 403-8, 408-13, and J. A. Walther, 'The Chronology of Passion Week', in *J.B.L.*, lxxvii (1958), 116-22.

14.55); witnesses are sought and cannot be found (Mark 14.55); the evidence was considerable but it did not cohere (Mark 14.56); later witnesses accuse Him of wishing to destroy the temple (Mark 14.56-58); then comes the judgment of the high priest. Is it really likely that all this took place in a single night?

Some critics have tended to give a negative answer to such a question, to discredit the Synoptic evidence on that account, to prefer John and then to claim that therefore the Last Supper could not have been a Passover. But it is questionable whether such a hasty conclusion does justice to the facts. Other critics have tried to find a way whereby the time between the arrest and the crucifixion might conceivably be longer than one night and one day; one of them[1] has even tried to put the crucifixion a week later on 21st Nisan. But none of these has ever met with any noteworthy support.

Matthew Black,[2] however, has recently drawn attention to the fact that traces of a tradition of the arrest and Supper as taking place earlier in the week are to be found in John's Gospel, and Mlle Jaubert[3] has also produced three bits of evidence from tradition which seems to lend credence to that idea.

The first is found in a document, the *Didascalia Apostolorum*,[4] which has an unusual chronology of Passion week. According to this tradition Jesus celebrated the Last Supper with His disciples on Tuesday of Passion week, in the evening, and was arrested later that night in the Garden of Gethsemane. This then gives two whole nights and one whole day between the arrest and the crucifixion.

The second bit comes from Epiphanius who protests that Jesus was not arrested on the night of Thursday-Friday; the false tradition for him is that which puts the Last Supper on Thursday evening, the correct one is that which puts it on Tuesday evening.

The third bit of evidence is found in Victorinus of Pettau, who by a most unusual chronology arrives at the idea that Jesus must have been arrested on a Wednesday.

A certain amount of other evidence for the Supper having

[1] Saalschutz, *Das Mosaische Recht* (Berlin, 1853).
[2] op. cit., 26.
[3] loc. cit.
[4] Ed. R. H. Connolly (Oxford, 1929).

taken place on 13th Nisan (i.e. Tuesday evening) can also be found in the Fathers, but this type of chronology conflicts so much with the Gospels that it has never been generally acceptable. There has also been a suspicion that the three bits of evidence were not independent and so their value has been questioned.

Even at this point in the inquiry, however, there is much to be said in favour of the Tuesday dating rather than the Thursday. The chief argument in its favour is that once the Thursday-Friday tradition got established it is difficult to see how the Tuesday idea could ever have been suggested. This seems to indicate that the Tuesday tradition is at any rate the older, and the Thursday-Friday would be very easily grasped by any one reading the Gospels.

But Mlle Jaubert has recently endeavoured to strengthen the case by introducing at this point the calendar of the *Book of Jubilees*.[1] After much careful investigation and argument she concludes that the calendar of the *Book of Jubilees* was apparently that used by the priestly school in the Hexateuch. Doubtless this calendar was threatened many times, especially after the Macedonian conquest and the spread of Hellenism, but there is a strong possibility that it was preserved by the Qumran sect. In this she derives support from Père D. Barthélemy,[2] who has shown that the calendar of the *Book of Jubilees* was used by the Qumran sect, and also from J. T. Milik.[3] J. Morgenstern,[4] starting from a different point, reaches conclusions that agree almost exactly with those of Mlle Jaubert, which he regards as an argument in favour of their validity, and actually identifies the early Hebrew calendar as the Pentecontad calendar.

This calendar of the *Book of Jubilees* differs from the one that would be in normal use in Jerusalem, dating from 150-100 B.C., and representing the priestly calendrical tradition of ancient Israel. It worked on a year of 364 days, containing four seasons, each consisting of two months of thirty days and one month of thirty-one days. The days of the feasts were fixed by

[1] 'Le calendrier des Jubilés et de la Secte de Qumrân. Ses Origines Bibliques', in *V.T.*, 3 (1953), 250-64.

[2] 'Le calendrier des Jubilés et les jours liturgiques de la semaine', in *V.T.*, 7 (1957), 35ff.

[3] *Ten Years of Discovery in the Desert of Judah.*

[4] 'The Calendar of the Book of Jubilees, its Origin and its Character', in *V.T.*, 5 (1955), 34-76.

the numbers of months and days, and since the year had exactly 52 weeks, they always fell on the same day of the week. This differed markedly from the official Jewish calendar, which was based on lunar months and which meant that feasts always fell on different days.

J. Morgenstern,[1] supported in part by Mlle Jaubert,[2] is of the opinion that this was not a practicable calendar and was used purely for ritual.[3] The Jews, he says, must have conformed to the lunar calendar of their neighbours in normal life, using this kind of calendar only for their sectarian activities, and he compares the present-day peasantry of Palestine who normally conform to the civil calendar, but who stick to the ancient calendar for the dating and celebration of their festivals. On this reckoning, Jesus and His disciples may well have come up to celebrate the Passover according to their sectarian religious calendar, only to find themselves somewhat restricted by the adherents of normative Judaism, and therefore having to adjust their religious life and calendar to the life and calendar of the Jewish world around them.

In the official calendar then, Passover was eaten on 15th Nisan and it could be any day of the week. In the other calendar it had to fall on a certain day; and we now know that since the first day of the season and of each week was a Wednesday it follows that 15th Nisan must also have been a Wednesday. Passover, therefore, according to this calendar, would be eaten on the Tuesday evening.

The coincidence between this discovery and the other somewhat suspect pieces of evidence is so striking that it must surely indicate the fact that lies behind them. If we accept it, the pattern becomes something like this:

Tuesday evening:	Jesus celebrates the Passover according to the ancient priestly tradition
Tuesday-Wednesday night:	the arrest
Friday:	crucifixion on the eve of the legal Jewish Passover

[1] op. cit., 64f. [2] loc. cit.

[3] This point has been challenged by E. R. Leach ('A Possible Method of Intercalation for the Calendar of the Book of Jubilees', in *V.T.*, 7 (1957), 392-7), who propounds a method of intercalation whereby this calendar may in fact have been a practical one and not simply a religious fiction.

This resolves the difficulty between John and the Synoptists. It means that, according to one calendar, the Synoptists are right in showing Jesus and His disciples partaking of the Passover prior to the arrest; it means that, according to another calendar, John is right in his picture of Jesus being slain at the time that the Passover lambs were being slain in the temple. The Supper then was in the evening of Passover, and the crucifixion was on the eve of Passover: but not the same Passover.

It may also mean that Jesus and His disciples would have to eat the Passover without the paschal lamb, since the Jewish officials would not be slaughtering lambs until the Friday, the official date, and would therefore perhaps help to explain why there is no mention of the paschal lamb in the Synoptic account.[1]

It further helps us over the difficulty of getting in all the events mentioned in the Gospels between the arrest and the crucifixion giving in fact an extra twenty-four hours. On this reckoning the pattern may be like this:

Tuesday-Wednesday night:	Jesus arrested and brought before the High Priest, Annas (John 18.13)
At cock-crow:	Jesus brought before Caiaphas (John 18.24)
Wednesday:	the Grand Council (Mark 14.55ff)
Thursday morning:	Verdict. Jesus brought before Pilate (Mark 15.1)

It is true that it is strange no mention is made of this longer period in the Gospels, but then we must not forget that they tend to be summaries rather than historical documents, and that their ethics of writing are not the same as ours.[2]

Some further support for this general thesis may perhaps be found in the fact that there are some indications that Jesus and the early Church did use this old priestly calendar on other occasions. Pentecost, for example, was always fixed on a Sunday. Should the theory be proven it would show con-

[1] P. W. Skehan, 'The Date of the Last Supper', in *C.B.Q.*, 20 (1958), 192-9.
[2] Cf. M. Black, op. cit., 19ff.

clusively that the Last Supper was a Passover, without at the same time detracting in any way from the theological implications of the picture as presented by John.

Not sufficient time has elapsed since this discovery was made for us to be able adequately to assess its reliability. It should be said at once that J. Jeremias[1] has reviewed Mlle Jaubert's book[2] and is not wholly convinced. After commending her wide knowledge and acute perception, he says, 'She writes so persuasively that not every reader may realise how problematic a good deal of it is.'

In the present state of our knowledge, therefore, the matter must be left open[3]. More research and discussion are needed. But it should not be forgotten that if any definite conclusions are reached as a result they are likely to be of more than academic interest.

[1] *J.T.S.*, 10 (1959), 131ff.
[2] *La Date de la Cène.*
[3] Since the above article was written Mlle Jaubert has replied to some of her critics in 'Jésus et le calendrier de Qumran', in *N.T.S.*, 7 (1960-61), 1-30.

THE APOSTLES' DOCTRINE AND FELLOWSHIP

by The Rev. I. M. FRASER

How Things Stand

Top-level conversations between Churches are a requisite of improved relationships. For separated Churches they are a focus of responsible thought, an occasion for humility before God and one another, producing new insight, an opportunity for severe and charitable intellectual honesty. But they do not carry the main colours of the movement towards reunion.

Necessarily so. Agreed statements are not by nature renewing things. They may conceal serious divergences: 'That agreed statements often do no more than provide a form of words by which different people can make the same noises while meaning different things, is widely recognised', Michael Bruce says trenchantly in his book *Barriers To Unity*. Yet more seriously, unless they are related to the convictions of the common membership of the Churches (whether these are well or ill grounded), they just hang in air.

The great need is for Christians of different communions to come afresh into community with one another right where they are: locally to open themselves in understanding to one another, to share in fact what they hold together in doctrine, to learn to abide one another where their convictions diverge, to enter more fully into their kinship in Christ. Unity will become real and native when churches begin to grow together in cities, towns and villages, like tissues in a body cleft apart by a wound.

At all levels unity must be sought on a basis of truth, simply because it is in Christ that we are one, and He is the Truth. To prophesy smooth things so that real issues are glossed over, is to to do Him disservice.

Ministry in the Church

Jesus Christ is the Head of the Body, the Church. The ministry the members exercise is through Him alone, who is

Head. Still, through His Church, He ministers to men. His ministry remains characteristic and initiating. All other ministries are dependent, derivative and participant.

The call to personal commitment to Christ and to membership of His Church is a call to participation in His ministry to men. It is Christ who calls. It is the Church, in its obedience, which recognises and confirms, laying on those who respond a share in His ministry.

Within this ministry is established the ordained ministry, the ministry of the Word and Sacraments. To this ministry too, Christ calls, just as, in the days of His flesh, He called the irreplaceable Twelve. By His grace the Church recognises and equips, and in His name authorises this ministry, which exists for the increase and upbuilding of the Body in its manifold ministry.

Those who become ordained ministers owe their calling and its confirmation not to predecessors in the office, but to Christ and His Church. There is no separate and self-perpetuating office within the Church, no succession to the twelve, no transference of the marks of apostleship down the centuries within a closed and separately authenticated society. It is through Christ in His Church that the marks of apostleship are bestowed. It is through Christ in His Church that men remain in unbroken fellowship with the apostles. It is through the Holy Spirit that they are ever and again established in the doctrine of the apostles. Continuity is established at points of discontinuity. No incumbent or group of incumbents of the office of the ordained ministry may transmit that ministry or any character of it to successors. What they may do is to acknowledge with gratitude the unfailing gift in the name of the Church, authorise what the Church would authorise, bestow what the Church bequeaths. There is continuity right at this point. It comes not from some character of institutional completeness, but from Christ's faithfulness. A ministry of Word and Sacraments is never wanting, *simply because Christ unfailingly raises up men and presents them to His Church*. True ministries of the past exist in Him. They do not continue themselves. Christ's provision of them in succeeding generations has proved sure: that is the heart of the succession of men to a true ministry of Word and Sacraments.

Yet the ordained ministry is often spoken about as if it existed in some separate right, with a continuance of its own.

As if its genuineness were to be established independently of the genuineness of the Church's ministry.

As if its authenticity were the chief sign and guarantee of that larger ministry.

As if the Church were to wait for its validation upon the establishment of the validity of its ordained ministry.

To hold this is to set the Head of the Church at one remove from the Body. It is to conceive the ministry of the Church as being exercised, not as a direct participation in Christ's ministry, but only through and by grace of an intermediate ministry. What happened at Pentecost? Was it that the necessary ministry was formed, and went out forthwith to call the Church into being; or that the Church, formed in Christ, was made manifest with the ordained ministry at its heart, was empowered, and sent into the world He loved?

The Head belongs to the Body and the Body to the Head, immediately. What the Head wills, the whole Body must attend to. Within it are organs: among them, crucially, the ordained ministry. The ordained ministry exists in organic relationship to all other parts.

Apostolic Succession

What, then, can apostolic succession mean?

It must be said from the start that 'succession' is a strange word to use of the growth of a body and the endowment of its parts. It roots the idea of apostolicity in the conception of lineal integrity. An inapt word, surely. Yet one which we can scarcely avoid: it has gained such currency.

What lies behind the phrase?

Something precious. The Church does not take shape according to the fashion of each age, but took shape in Jesus Christ. The testimony of the witnesses to His triumphant work is decisive, and their life in the Church, in the first flowering of faith, of lasting significance. To the doctrine and life of the apostolic Church we must remain faithful in succeeding generations. We are not to return to imitate or echo. Jesus looked down the centuries when He said: 'Greater things than these shall ye do because I go unto my Father.' We are

to return as to well-springs. In company with the apostles, who remain with us in the communion of saints, we are to set out in our day to obey the same Lord. Founded on their doctrine, stirred by their faithfulness, encouraged by their presence, instructed by those who have entered into their labours down the Christian centuries, we succeed to their enterprise.

Who succeeds to apostolicity?

Surely the Church, principally: and within that, a faithful company of the ordained. The Church in each age succeeds to an apostolic inheritance and an apostolic task. Within it, the ordained ministry succeeds to a certain power and authority. Why is this latter given? Why but to fit out the Church and nourish it for the appropriation of the inheritance and the undertaking of the task. What the ordained minister succeeds to essentially is a *part in a missionary enterprise and fellowship*. The power and authority are not indigenous to the ordained ministry, are not a prize to be grasped at. They are the means whereby the whole Church may be strengthened in its mission. The ordained ministry is an apostolic ministry in these terms.

Lineal Succession

We have contended that the Church participates in Christ's Ministry to His world, that it is sent into all the world: and that, within it, as a special gift, the ordained ministry is provided. The continuity of the Church's apostleship, and that of the ordained ministry, depends on the once-for-all character of the work of Christ, in whom the Church was founded, and on His present call and commission, who constitutes the Church in living presence and provides requisite ministries.

What virtue lies, then, in an immaculate line of succession, traced back to the apostles in the first century?

It bears no assurance of authentic continuance of the ministry in itself. The ordained ministry must be apostolic in character: but this character is not bestowed by predecessors in the office by virtue of their own succession to it, but through and within a Church obedient to its living Lord.

It is to a part in an enterprise, not to a status duly trans-

mitted that a minister essentially succeeds. The status comes from faithfulness in fulfilling the role in that enterprise; the nature of the status is set forth by Christ, kneeling and washing His disciples' feet.

Christ, while He gives us institutional means of serving Him, would appear deliberately to have denied us foolproof institutional lineages on which to lean. Probably because those who fulfilled the requirements would be so easily tempted to go about establishing their own righteousness. There were the Twelve who were to sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes. How does Judas' defection affect the promise?—he was included in it. Will there be but eleven thrones? Is Judas to be replaced by Matthias in this too? Did Jesus visualise an organic fulfilment of the promises to the Chosen People in this promise, or was it institutional and particular, a promise which events rendered impossible of fulfilment?

Consider the Apostles, witnesses to Christ's resurrection, and the man born out of due time, who laboured more than they all.

God, who forbade men to trust in the rite of circumcision or in having Abraham to their father, still insists that we walk by faith and not by sight. A desire to have an immaculate line of succession to which to point, is a desire to walk by sight.

It is quite a different matter to give grateful thanks for the goodly heritage one enters into in the ordained ministry, to rejoice to have part and lot with those who served Christ so in past ages, to have a sense of continuity in this particular responsibility and privilege within the Church.

It is also quite a different matter that the Church attend reverently to its responsibility for the continuance within it of a true ministry of the Word and Sacraments. It has to be alert to Christ's will, to test the spirits of men who believe they are called, to equip adequately, to bestow orderly the gifts and authority Christ offers for the work. The good order of the Church is an increment of the work of God who brought order out of chaos, a sign of His consistency in all the ways of salvation He proposes for men.

We must walk orderly before Him: and we must walk by faith, not by sight.

The Reformation

How does the event of the Reformation affect the continuance of Church and ordained ministry in the apostles doctrine and fellowship?

There is a continuity in discontinuity which is characteristic of the life of God's people. Slavery in Egypt, and Exile but revealed God's constancy. The prophetic tradition was upheld by Amos, yet he was no prophet nor the son of a prophet. The promises to the Old Israel were confirmed when Paul turned from them and went to the Gentiles. It was through death that Jesus continued His ministry: the words 'body' and 'blood' still bring us the sense of continuity of life and abrupt sacrificial break as aspects of one action. It is by dying that God's people live. It is in losing life that they find it.

Continuity comes from the gracious, dependable provision of God, not from an order of things native to the life of God's people.

God can of the stones raise up children unto Abraham. If the children are silenced the stones will immediately cry out. God remains free. We are not to turn the constancy of his gracious provision into harness for His shoulders. If He chooses to make a break, it is not to turn His back on men; of that we can be assured in Christ: it is to continue His favour. What matters for Church and ministry then, is not that they maintain intact a certain institutional character, but that they be as clay in the Potter's hands, for Him to shape and reshape at will. Church and ministry stand before the world as the manifest people of God when they are a community broken and remade in age after age so that they remain His own people. Thus they are true to the apostles' doctrine, bound into the apostles' fellowship.

At the Reformation, the Church, seeking to repent of its disobedient life, submitted that life afresh to Christ, looked to its origins in the first century through the Scriptures, and became re-established on apostolic foundations. This meant a break. But it was a break which made possible the continuity of the people of God *as His obedient people*. It was a break which re-established within the Church a true ministry of word and sacraments. It released a stunted body into new growth. The

price—a more seriously fragmented Church—was a heavy one. Yet the fragmentation would seem at that time to have been unavoidable. The Old Church remained at first entrenched in its disobedience: were the watchmen to keep silence, was the doctrine and fellowship of the apostles to count for nothing?

At the Reformation, the Church and ministry, which had freed themselves to such a large extent of their mission in life, succeeded afresh to their apostolic character and enterprise. How odd it sounds, then, that some invite us to 'come into the true succession of the Church's ministry'! The Reformation re-affirmed and renewed that succession when it had become a dead letter. It safeguarded it as a true inheritance for the whole Church when it was being abandoned.

To depart from the remit of Christ to His Church is always to depart from apostolicity.

Episcopacy

The proposal that episcopacy should be a necessary mark of a reunited Church stands separate from the question of apostolic succession, looked at in this light. It must be considered on its merits.

The character of the world-wide Church is overwhelmingly episcopal.

Episcopacy is manifestly agreeable to the Word of God. There are great fruits produced under it for which we give glad thanks to God. As those who (in the ordained ministry of the Church of Scotland) hold that our own system is 'agreeable to the Word of God', we should be ready to acknowledge this system to be similarly agreeable.

We are yet loth to alter our prejudiced picture of the episcopate. We remain deep-set in unreasoning antipathies. The 'gaitered cratur', the prelate, the remote administrator—in these terms we dismiss the thought of the bishop. We are determined to be unreformed, determined to refuse to open eyes and minds to new possibilities. Thus we are sealed against the Holy Spirit. For this we stand condemned before God.

We give scant encouragement (probably because they provide irrefutable proof that the bishop need be neither prelatic nor remote) to new forms of episcopacy which are emerging in the world Church (e.g. in India) whose character makes nonsense

of our old entrenched fears. We are doing little or nothing to help these new and hopeful developments.

The Church of the future may well have an episcopal structure. We must not stand against God if this is what He sets before us.. I can say that twice: I think we may well be prepared to stand even against God if this is what He lays upon us!

This said, let us look at the claim that the structure of a reunited Church must be *necessarily* episcopal. This form is set before us as original, as particularly apt to express the Church's unity, as having outstanding merits of its own.

We cannot go to the New Testament and apostolic age and distinguish a clear system of church government which we can accept as a final form. This, by the grace of God and in the intention of God, I believe. Mists shroud the apostolic age before a structure like that of the episcopal hierarchy develops and is accepted by even a part of the Church. Episcopacy cannot trace its gift as *the prescribed growth* from apostolic roots. It hazards that this may be so. It presumes at times that it is so. The trouble is that, resting on such unfounded assumptions, one so often finds a mould of unspoken conviction that the Church does not really exist as a true Church of Christ except where the historic episcopate can be distinguished.

Is episcopacy particularly relevant at a time when God lays upon the hearts of Christians their unity in Christ? Look to the past. Are there greater fissures in the world Church than those between episcopates, Orthodox, Anglican and Roman? In Britain, have there been larger and more lasting cleavages than those caused by secession from episcopacy? The splits between Presbyterians in Scotland were more numerous: but they have been substantially healed, and within Presbyterian Churches healing goes on. Look to the present. Where Churches have been reunited and *episcopacy has been accepted in their united life*, where is acknowledgment hardest to gain? Is it not of episcopal Churches? If episcopacy provides a form particularly suited to the task of reunion, it does not leap to the eye.

There remains the experience of those who have grown up in this inheritance. They remind us that we can get a true view of episcopacy only through living contact, not through

argument. One needs to live with episcopacy to appreciate the richness of the gift it confers. I find their testimony persuasive and humbling.

There is a logic of all this. Whether our Church takes episcopacy into its life; whether God calls it to maintain a form of life whose existence provides a continual reminder that no one structure of church government is final (the episcopate has proved deficient in self-criticism in many past centuries: standing reminders of the inadequacy of every earthly form of the Church may continue to be required by God); or whether we are brought on to new ground and into a richer unity than we can envisage in our separated traditions: one thing is clear. No arguments exist which can reason those who have no experience of episcopal government into an appreciation of its boon. Nothing short of living with it will avail. The logic of a deep regard for episcopacy which cannot get across by argument but only by experience, is that we enter into the experience. The clear conclusion of the episcopal position is that Anglican and Presbyterian Churches accept one another exactly as they are, live in community with one another as united Churches, and learn what God will teach them together.

THE MARCAN FRAMEWORK

by The Rev. HARRY SAWYERR

SOME SUGGESTIONS FOR A NEW ASSESSMENT

In 1932, Professor Dodd published in the *Expository Times* an article on 'The Order of Events in St. Mark's Gospel' which broke fresh ground in the Study of that Gospel. Dr Dodd then stated that in planning the first ten chapters St. Mark had a skeleton outline of our Lord's earthly career which he broke up into what now stand as editorial summaries. This outline he suggested was in the nature of a summary of the *kerygma* and approximated to the Petrine speech of Acts 10.37-41 or the Pauline speech in Acts 13.23-31. Into this outline were inserted the pericopae Mark collected sometimes on a historical, and at other times on a topical basis. This hypothesis held the field for a considerable time but it has recently been questioned by Professor Nineham in an examination of Dr Dodd's hypothesis in his contribution to *Studies in the Gospels* published in 1955. Indeed Professor Nineham takes the line that the presupposition of such a skeleton outline of our Lord's ministry which Mark used in the way Dr Dodd suggests is 'highly improbable'.[1] He questions the probability of such an outline having been preserved by the early Church. Referring to the changes in the Marcan pattern which both Matthew and Luke felt free to introduce when using St. Mark's Gospel as a basis, and to the difference in outlook between St. John's Gospel and the Synoptics, he concludes: 'It does not appear that the precise order in which the saving events occurred seemed to the early Christian mind a very vital element in the saving proclamation or kerygma.'[2] Professor Nineham is of course prepared to admit that the Passion narrative is in a class by itself and does not appear to question the accepted opinions of scholars that it was an early compilation of the primitive Church. But he rightly contends that there is no cogent evidence that the Church quite early agreed on 'a formal outline account of the progress of the Lord's earthly ministry'.[3] Two points ought to

[1] *Studies in the Gospels*, ed. Nineham (London, 1955), p. 230.
[2] ibid., p. 23.
[3] ibid., p. 229.

be noted here. First, Dr Dodd's outline is the result of a stitching process by which he put together all the editorial summaries and subsequently found that they made a consecutive account. Was this one of the rare accidents of literary criticism? Secondly, Professor Nineham, as far as the writer could judge, seems to be working on the theory that the Gospel material was circulating orally in the early Church until possibly Mark first put pen to paper. Is this a wholly justifiable assumption? Both positions seem to be defective and in this article we will attempt to make an assessment of the Gospel background.

To take first Professor Nineham's apparently total rejection of an outline summary of our Lord's ministry. Was such a summary improbable? It is important to note that if Acts was intended to be a second volume of the Gospel according to St. Luke, then we must not imply as Professor Nineham has pointed out that any summary of our Lord's ministry in Acts could be genetically prior to the material already presented in Luke, which does not imply such a summary. Professor Nineham rightly calls attention to the fact that the speeches in Acts have a Thucydidean look, having been composed by St. Luke from the sources available to him. But does this factor rule out the possibility that there existed in the early Church, a pattern of thought with which St. Luke was familiar and which has been formative in the composition of the speeches in Acts 10.32-41 and 13.23-31? W. L. Knox's book on the Acts of the Apostles published in 1947 had demonstrated sufficiently even if not wholly conclusively, that Luke used sources which had been circulating in the large Church centres—Jerusalem and Antioch. Even Dibelius concedes sources for some of the material of Acts.[1] Can one then completely rule out the probable existence of a summary of our Lord's Galilean ministry in the early Church or at least a preservation of the memory of some of the main events? Two other works by English scholars—Guy's *The Origin of the Gospel of St. Mark* and Knox's *The Sources of the Synoptic Gospels*, written from different points of view, seem to point definitely to the existence of such summaries. Guy introduces the role of the early preachers and the part they played in propagating

[1] See Dibelius, *Studies in Acts*, ed. Greeven (London, 1956), pp. 1-25.

the Gospel stories. Guy isolates certain interesting features in the development of the Gospel tradition. First he stresses that preachers interjected certain personal comments as they addressed various audiences—e.g. saying with a wave of the hand, 'There be some standing here who shall in no wise taste of death until they see the kingdom of God come with power' (Mark 9.1). These comments, he suggests, were embedded in the Gospel accounts when they were reduced to writing.[1] Next he suggests the further point, that preachers tended to repeat themselves and so the form in which the stories were repeated assumed 'something like a set form'.[2] Such stories, including the comments of the preachers already referred to were then reduced to writing by a scribe or scribes and that provided the material which Mark used for compiling his Gospel.[3] He did not say, but we could however infer, that not all the itinerant preachers had been with Jesus during his lifetime. This would lead to the further inference that the itinerant preachers depended on the disciples and the leaders of the large Churches say, in Jerusalem and Antioch, for data which they could use in their preaching. Guy's work is worth some notice even if we do not feel able to accept his suggestion that some of the now vital passages in Mark like 9.1 and 14.62, 16.8 were 'asides flung out by a preacher'[4] or comments and explanations added to emphasise a point.[5] Perhaps there is room for a closer investigation of the role of the preachers in the propagation and formulation of the Gospel story.

W. L. Knox's posthumous work on the *Sources of the Synoptic Gospels* is more scholarly and deserves greater attention than Guy's *Origin of the Gospel of St. Mark*. He puts forward the view that the primitive Church was in a situation which demanded 'collections of sayings and doings of Jesus' in order to fill out the homiletic and testimonial data used in the kerygma. Therefore he states that 'a number of Tracts containing accounts of the Ministry of the Lord on earth, either written or committed to memory'[6] were produced for the use of travelling evangelists. He alsc refers to the fact that the separation of the Church

[1] The Origin of the Gospel of St. Mark (London, 1951), p. 106.
[2] ibid., p. 115.
[3] ibid., p. 116. See also Farrer, *A Study in Mark* (London, 1951), p. 367f.
[4] ibid., p. 76. [5] ibid. (see chap. IX).
[6] *Sources of the Synoptic Gospels* (London, 1953), p. 4.

from the synagogue might have involved expulsions from the synagogue and in such cases, in particular, 'it seems quite incredible', he writes, '. . . that there would be no attempt to provide a record of what Jesus had done and taught'.[1] He explicitly suggests that the Churches, e.g. Jerusalem and Antioch, would have been responsible for preparing the data required for the use of the evangelist preachers. He therefore seeks to isolate various sources which were in existence before Mark compiled his Gospel, e.g. Conflict Stories, the Twelve Source, Jesus and the Devils, Books of Miracles, Nazareth and John the Baptist. Some of these sources stand in Mark near to their original form but others like the Twelve Sources have been split up and various other stories sandwiched between the sections.

His estimate of the Twelve Source is instructive for the present study. He believes it stood 'as a brief summary of the ministry of Jesus, containing a picture of his teaching and healings by the sea, his appointment of the Twelve and his method of using them'. He then goes on to say, 'Thus it would appear that we have evidence that the biographical tradition implied in Acts 10.37 was in fact formulated in a summary account of the career of Jesus with a few incidents mainly concerned with the position of the Twelve as the leaders of the primitive Jewish Church.'[2] This is a remarkable suggestion for it gives point to the substance of Dodd's hypothesis even if we find it difficult to accept the latter's needle-and-thread method of determining the outline which he believed was adopted by Mark. Knox's later statement about the Twelve Source is equally relevant here. 'It is possible', he writes, 'that in its original form the Source consisted of a "biographical" summary alone, i.e. that it was an expanded form of Acts 10.38. . . .'[3]

In discussing the sections 1.21-39 and 3.30 he suggests that 3.20-30 is an ill-fitting combination of two incidents which do not seem to belong to the same stage of the ministry and therefore 3.20-21, 31-35 (omitting 31a) 'might very well follow 1.39'. But he adds, 'This source, which describes Jesus' conquest of devils, the view of his relatives that he was mad (i.e. that he himself was possessed by a devil), and the refutation of

[1] ibid., p. 5. [2] ibid., p. 28. [3] ibid., p. 31.

the view that he cast out devils by Beelzebub, was, like the "conflict source", a short summary of the whole of Jesus' career in this matter, containing incidents drawn from various stages.'[1]

Later, in connexion with the Books of Miracles, he suggests that the 'selections of miracles' in the Gospel 'are intended to form part of the kerygma of how Jesus went about doing good because God was with him'.[2]

The present writer's impression from a careful study of Mark's Gospel supports the suggestion that in Mark we have an expanded form of the pattern of teaching which we find in the summary of Acts 10.37-41. There seems to be present in the Acts passage an interest in the Person of our Lord. He was the man through whom peace was proclaimed to the Children of Israel; God had anointed Him with the Holy Spirit and with power. He went about doing good and healing all those who were thoroughly in the grip of the devil . . . whom God raised from the dead on the third day; He was designated by God to be the judge of the living and the dead.

In Mark, the same pattern of thought is present. The dominant interest seems to be the Person of Jesus Christ—Son of God and Son of Man, with an emphasis on the human side of Jesus as R. H. Lightfoot points out.[3]

Jesus Christ is the Son of God who is so designated privately when the Holy Spirit descended upon Him after His Baptism. After the Temptation in the Wilderness He goes out to Galilee teaching and healing. He casts out devils and heals divers diseases all of which, to Jewish minds, are traceable to demons; the devils therefore proclaim Him as 'the Holy One of God (1.24), the 'Son of the Most High' (5.7). He forgives sins (2.5), thus appearing to the Pharisees to be encroaching on God's prerogative (2.7). He raises the dead even if Jairus' daughter only seemed dead to Him. At the same time, he teaches with authority and not as the scribes to the amazement of His audience (1.22) and His fame spreads throughout all Galilee (1.28).

Mark does not give any details of our Lord's experience in the wilderness but the statement that he was with the wild

[1] ibid., p. 32. [2] ibid., p. 44.
[3] *St. John*, ed. Evans (London, 1957), p. 57.

beasts may imply as has been suggested[1] that Christ had entered a preliminary engagement with evil especially in respect of human and cosmic factors—the principalities and powers which St. Paul says so much about. The campaign here referred to was to last throughout His Ministry as St. Luke so explicitly suggests (Luke 4.13). We would however add that, even in the absence of any overt information on the point, Mark intends us to understand that Jesus defeated Satan in the wilderness, a victory that was to be repeated over and over again during His Ministry and, finally, on the Cross.

So then even if Mark had no specific outline in front of him, he seems to be following a pattern of thought not unknown to the primitive Church. If Knox is right, as we are inclined to think, then Mark has certain sources available, one, at least, of which seems to be biographical in essence. We would therefore submit that Professor Nineham has overlooked the evidence that points to the existence in the early Church of data depicting various stages of the 'saving acts' as found in the life of Christ. Glimpses from St. Paul's letters like 1 Cor. 11.23f, 15.3 also confirm this view. But Professor Nineham's article ends with the demand that scholars should address themselves to the questions:

'What consideration did control Mark in the ordering of his material and what sort of conclusions were meant to be drawn in detail from the way in which he has arranged it?'[2]

These are difficult questions. Let us however examine two answers which appeared before Professor Nineham wrote his essay but which would be relevant to this discussion. First Dr Carrington in his *Primitive Christian Calendar* has put forward the suggestion that St. Mark's Gospel was arranged 'for the liturgical year with a view to having it read in Churches'.[3] In particular, although it was devised in its present form for the Church of Rome, yet the arrangement was based on a 'simplified form of the old Hebrew Calendar as used by Jewish Christians in Palestine' where Christianity took its origin. Dr Carrington however goes on to specify that the Calendar implied that Mark had its origin in Galilee. 'Apart from the Preaching of John, the Baptism of Jesus and the Temptation

[1] Caird, *Principalities and Powers*, p. 70. [2] op. cit., p. 238.
[3] *Primitive Christian Calendar* (London, 1952), p. 43.

by Satan, . . . the first part of Mark is a Galilean document, whether oral or written.'[1]

1 Mark, as he calls this section, was therefore a 'local Gospel for use in Galilee'.[2] It 'is not a life of Jesus or even an account of his teachings; it is an account of the origins of the Christianity of Galilee and the "beginning" in Galilee of the Gospel which subsequently expanded throughout the world'.[3] Dr Carrington then proceeds to illustrate that Mark 1-10 divides into 60 units which hinge around the great Jewish Festivals. These arranged in terms of a Galilean Calendar appeared as follows:

New Year	*The Spring Sowing*	*Passover*
Preaching of John	The Seed Parables	The feeding of the Five Thousand
Beginnings in Galilee	Works of Power	Jesus as Law-giver
Pentecost	*Midsummer*	*Tabernacles*
The Four Thousand	The Transfiguration	Bartimaeus
The Confession of Peter	The Three Passion Announcements and pendant teachings	Entry into Jerusalem, Teaching in the Temple: The Little Apocalypse

This material was organised on a triadic structure which Dr Carrington admits is of a complicated pattern. He therefore concludes that a student of the triads will find it 'impossible to classify Mark as an "artless" and simple composition, put together by a person of no literary skill'.[4] The acts of Jesus were therefore organised in terms of the great Jewish Festivals leading up to the message from the tomb as the climax of the Passion Narrative which was the Gospel text for the Paschal solemnity.

Interesting as Dr Carrington's detailed study is, it does not seem to provide a direct answer to Professor Nineham's questions.

Austin Farrer on the other hand, in his study of St. Mark, while allowing for a liturgical pattern[5] prefers to adopt a simpler pattern based on a short recurrent cycle of topics. For him, Mark set out to write what had 'a beginning, a middle and an end and moved steadily to an overwhelming climax'.[6] But he had to start *ab initio*—'he had no written original, nor

[1] ibid., p. 79; cf. Vincent Taylor, *St. Mark*, p. 132.
[2] ibid., p. 80. [3] ibid., p. 81. [4] ibid., p. 92.
[5] op. cit., p. 33. [6] ibid., p. 26.

continuous oral repetition even to guide him'.[1] Farrer therefore deduces a symbolic pattern with strong arithmetical associations based on numerical equivalence.[2] The theme is constant but the topics recur. One such cyclic recurrence can be expressed as call-healing—controversy with (or indignation of) Pharisees (1.16-2.12, 2.13-3.6); feeding of multitude, Christ's prophecy of His Passion (8.31, 9.31, 10.33).[3] St. Mark is thus according to Farrer giving a theological interpretation to the History of Christ. 'St. Mark indeed . . . is showing how Christ's life was a visible enactment of . . . the saving truth'[4] because he 'sees our salvation through Jesus as a spiritual exodus and a conquest of the true Promised Land'.[5] 'He is writing a Gospel parallel to the incident of Moses' staff.'[6] So in working out the cycles, Mark plans 'each new paragraph on the model of the last but one'. Thus, e.g., the account of the paralytic is written 'on the model of the paragraph preceding the leper', working in pairs. According to Farrer there is 'a balance between calling and healing', e.g. the Call of Peter, Andrew, James and John is balanced by four healings—in unclean spirits, Peter's mother-in-law, leper and paralytic (1.16-20; 1.23-27, 29-31, 40-44; 2.1-12). The call of Simon, Our Lord's entry into Simon's house is paralleled by the Call of Levi and the feast in Levi's house. Sabbath exorcism, cleansing of the leper and raising of the paralytic are paralleled by the Sabbath-Law in relation to the disciples' rubbing the ears of corn, healing of the man with the withered hand on the Sabbath.

Christ's entry into the synagogue in 1.21f is balanced by another entry into the synagogue in 3.1.

St. Mark was however writing history. Farrer denies the validity of the *Formgeschichte* assumptions of *disjecta membra*,[7] anecdotes which were strung together by the Evangelist, and assumes that the elements found in Mark 'bear the stamp of having been composed for the place in which they stand'.[8] Such a composition therefore had a pattern.

Thus he suggests that the plotting of the Pharisees with the Herodians is set in a place of emphasis because it prefigures 'the

[1] ibid., p. 27. [2] ibid., p. 79. [3] ibid., p. 34f.
[4] ibid., p. 34. [5] ibid., p. 55. [6] ibid., p. 76.
[7] ibid., p. 65. [8] ibid., p. 5. [9] ibid., p. 187.

priests compassing Christ's death by bringing the secular power into the case'.[1] So according to Farrer, 1 Mark's history is divided up into five double cycles, one of which runs as follows.

(*a*) Baptism of Jesus, the Temptation, Arrest of John, Preaching by Jesus. A day in Capernaum—visit to the synagogue, cures of unclean spirit and other sick folk—resort to the wilderness, preaching through the villages of Galilee, crowds gather around; cure of paralytic, controversy with the Pharisees.

(*b*) Call of Levi, Pharisees scandalised, Christ's claim of freedom in His own and His disciples' observance of the Law. Crisis in the Synagogue at Capernaum; the elders would have secured the intervention of Herod. Christ's withdrawal from the Synagogue, multitudes from afar come to Him.

The figures in Mark are based on Old Testament symbolism as e.g. the Call of the Twelve. In fact there are thirteen disciples when Levi is included although only twelve are usually referred to. This is suggestive of the Twelve tribes of Israel in the Old Testament when in fact with Benjamin and Manasseh there were thirteen. The Call of the Twelve is suggestive of 'a Sinai Covenant' which 'must embrace a whole twelve-fold Israel, at least in symbol'.[2] In the later *St. Matthew and St. Mark* Farrer recants some of his earlier ideas but states that Mark has a habit of sketching 'a comparatively simple model or theme within a limited compass, and then [working] out variations on it with great suitability and at greater length'.[3]

Call and healings are in correspondence; 'the apostolic theme is progressive, the healing theme is repetitive and static'.[4] So we find twelve Apostles—Jews—and one outcast Jew called Levi—in correspondence with twelve Israelites healed and one Gentile healed.

Levi's Call is intrusive—it is a 'numerical superfluity' over and above the call of the Twelve who represent the Twelve tribes of Israel. So is the healing of the Gentile woman's daughter. Farrer regards the comment 'It is not meet to take

[1] ibid., p. 188. [2] ibid., p. 80f; cf. p. 303.
[3] *St. Matthew and St. Mark* (London, 1954), p. 93. [4] ibid., p. 84.

the children's loaf and cast it to the dogs' as symbolic of the superfluity of the cure.

The Feedings of the multitudes also symbolise a number pattern related first to the twelve apostles and so to the twelve tribes of Israel. But since Farrer presupposes that the calls are related to the healings, he works out a system which embraces both the intrusive nature of Levi's call as well as of the healing of the Syrophoenician woman's daughter. The cure of the Gentile woman's daughter is reported between the accounts of the two feedings[1]; the conversation between our Lord and the woman calls for crumbs which should be available to the dogs. So provision is sought first for the House of Israel, the twelve children, at the same time allowing for crumbs for the outcasts. Accordingly twelve loaves must be provided—a loaf being one person's portion of bread.[2]

Therefore at the feeding of the Five Thousand, five loaves are available although twelve basketfuls of crumbs are gathered up. Since there were twelve Apostles, there were therefore seven who had no 'loaf' provided. The fragments are a promise of later provision. This is rectified at the feeding of the Four Thousand when seven loaves were available. Seven and five making twelve thus allows for a full provision of one loaf per person. By an ingenious calculation, Farrer arrives at the crumbs for which the 'intruding' Gentile world is waiting. The *cophini* are larger than the *spurides*—Farrer uses the terms 'basket' and 'creel' respectively.

At the feeding of the Five Thousand twelve creelfuls of crumbs are collected, but at the feeding of the Four Thousand seven basketfuls are taken. That means that this time there are five creels not provided for the children. This implies that the original promise of 'adequate crumbs' for the children has been diverted and they now have only seven basketfuls. The necessary five have been diverted to the Gentiles. 'There was a time when the full creels of heavenly provision were for the thousands of Israel. But now that crumbs have been allotted to the Gentiles, only a basketful in every creelful is kept for the children, the rest fall to the dogs.'[3] And yet in fact only four of the seven children who in terms of the first feeding had remained unfed 'were as yet present to receive' their portion.[4]

[1] ibid., p. 63. [2] ibid., p. 64. [3] ibid., p. 68. [4] ibid., p. 75.

Farrer's discussion of the topics already mentioned raises several questions: (*a*) How far is Mark's record true of the actual situation of our Lord's acts if Farrer has correctly interpreted Mark? (*b*) Did Mark record two feedings deliberately so as to provide the arithmetical factors required for his number pattern? (*c*) Did Mark only mention twelve Israelites and one Gentile as having been healed by Jesus, once more to produce a number pattern equivalent to the number pattern of Israel—thirteen tribes in fact, although reference is only made to twelve? (*d*) Did Mark deliberately place the healing of the Gentile girl in its present setting so as to demonstrate its intrusiveness?[1] Farrer seems to me to have tried to overcome some of the complications created by his ingenuity by saying that 'Mark writes his Gospel round three twelves; apostles, loaves and sufferers healed. But plainly the three twelves do not play an identical or equal part in the general pattern of his narrative.'[2] The antecedental faith of the Syrophoenician woman therefore indicates the coming in of the Gentiles to Christ as a provision to counteract His later rejection by the Jews. So they are 'rewarded with a great part of the crumbs'.[3] They all however crystallise in the person of Jesus Christ. He is the fourteenth person healed in the Gospel, i.e. at His resurrection, and He represents in a unity all the other persons already healed.[4] It seems probable that Farrer is pairing off this fourteenth healing with a fourteenth loaf, viz. that of the Last Supper.[5] The same idea is expressed differently in St. Matthew and St. Mark where the 'one loaf' of the Last Supper is a thirteenth, paired off by a thirteenth apostle (?)—a passenger on the boat (8.13ff)—if 'not after all, Levi the Publican, but Christ himself . . .'.[6]

Again Farrer's interpretation of the conversation about bread in 8.14f seems rather extravagant. He identifies the 'one bread' in the possession of the disciples with Christ Himself who must remain 'uncontaminated by Pharisaic and Herodian leaven'—which suggests his rejection.[7] The short supply in the disciples' store indicates that they had given of their best to Israel (twelve tribes) but there is need for another

[1] ibid., pp. 81ff. [2] ibid., p. 82. [3] ibid., p. 69.
[4] *St. Mark*, p. 52. [5] ibid., p. 297.
[6] *St. Matthew and St. Mark*, p. 73. [7] ibid., p. 61.

'intrusive' thirteenth loaf never to be overtly mentioned as such, i.e. Christ Himself being given to the world as the Bread of life.[1] Just as the greater part of the provision of creelfuls of crumbs has been diverted to the Gentiles so the thirteenth loaf, corresponding to the thirteenth healing, is a 'promise of myriad Gentile baptisms in the Church'.[2]

The relation of calls and loaves and healings could thus be summarised.

Twelve Israelites called plus a thirteenth—an apostate Jew.

Twelve loaves provided plus a thirteenth—Jesus Christ.

Twelve Israelites healed plus a thirteenth—a Gentile.

But how certain can we be that the Gerasene demoniac was an Israelite? To my mind he seems to have been presented by Mark as the first Gentile Keryx of Christianity (cf. Mark 5.20). Farrer does not seem to have given us any real help towards answering Professor Nineham's questions unless one is inclined to assume that the picture of Christ in St. Mark is a prototype of a historical play—say Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* or *Richard III*.[3]

I would therefore depart from both Dr Carrington and Dr Farrer and say that in Mark we have primarily a presentation of Christ's struggle with and conquest over evil, which is embodied in the nomenclature Satan.[4] This struggle takes place:

(1) Chiefly in the wilderness (ἔρημος τόπος) and by the sea-side;

(2) in the various cures especially of the demonic;

(3) in the disputes with the religious and political powers.

We meet references to the wilderness in 1.13, 35, 45; 6.31; 8.14. It is significant that the opening pattern of Temptation-in-the-wilderness followed by preaching in 1.15 is repeated with slight variations several times, e.g. at Capernaum: our Lord goes to the wilderness after performing the many cures which follow the healing of Peter's mother-in-law (1.35) (and resists pressure by Peter to go back to the pursuant crowds, 1.36f). He then goes on a circuit round the synagogues of Galilee preaching the Kingdom (1.39). So too the cure of the

[1] ibid., p. 71. [2] ibid., p. 72.

[3] Dr Farrer himself finds the Marcan plot too complicated to admit of that yardstick, *St. Mark*, p. 30f.

[4] Farrer recognises this feature of St. Mark but does not attach enough importance to it. See especially *St. Mark*, pp. 235f, 245, 315.

leper who must have reported himself to the 'priest' on our Lord's instructions and, more so, must have gone about proclaiming the good news of his cure, resulted in Jesus' flight into the wilderness to avoid publicity (1.44f). This time however crowds sought him there (1.45). Two other references are in connexion with the feedings of the multitudes. In Mark 6 the fame of our Lord had spread because of the activities of the Twelve during their mission (6.14). Suspicions of a political movement are roused in Herod, who associates our Lord at least with John the Baptist whom he had beheaded. So our Lord resorts with His disciples to a desert place (6.31), but crowds followed Him. He teaches them and feeds them. In Mark 8 there is a second story of feedings taking place in a similar type of territory and of the same nature as that of the first. We have to wait for the account of the objective struggle during the first visit to the wilderness to see how relevant these feedings were. Our Lord did multiply bread, in both cases, but not to appease His hunger. Equally just as, after our Lord's return from the Temptation, He began to preach the Kingdom of God (1.15), so in 1.39f He goes off to preach—the Kingdom, no doubt. In 1.45, people come to Him from all parts. He must have preached the Kingdom then. But He avoided all publicity and easy fame (1.37f, 1.45). The feedings are set in the context of an intensive teaching campaign and so the demonstration of Christ's powers is set in the context of a kerygmatic programme. But it is also set in the context of a personal seclusiveness.

The manifestation of His powers led to a struggle with the religious and political powers. We find references to Herod or the Herodians in 3.6, 6.14, 8.15 and 12.13. In three of these they are in association with the Pharisees.

The first passage related to the cure of the man with the withered hand. In the dispute that preceded the cure, our Lord had asked questions which struck at the root of the Covenant of the Sabbath and which made Him sound heretical. In the last passage an attempt was made to entrap Him for sedition. In 8.15, our Lord warns the disciples of the evil influence of Herod and of the Pharisees; 6.14 presents to us Herod himself as Satan, in the context of his murder of John the Baptist.

I suggest that all these references imply an attempt or attempts to put our Lord to death (cf. 3.6), and that the conjunction of Pharisees with Herodians implies that an attempt was being made to catch our Lord in a pincer movement. The Pharisees, had He, say, been in Judaea, would have liked to arrest Him for blasphemy or heresy, but He is in fact in foreign territory. So they look for political help to seize Him. I think the journey to Tyre and later to Decapolis confirms this view. It is significant that when our Lord begins to teach His disciples openly (*παρρησίᾳ*) of Himself, He is in Gentile territory around the borders of Caesarea Philippi, not in Galilee or Judaea (8.32).[1]

We might also observe that the accounts of the two feedings were followed in each case by a fierce dispute which militated against the religious leaders. The account of the feeding of the Five Thousand is followed by a dispute with Pharisees from Jerusalem over the Traditions of the Elders. They accuse our Lord's disciples of eating with 'unwashed hands'. Our Lord inveighs against them over their outward washings of 'cups and pots and brazen vessels and tables' (7.5) (A.D.), and their misuse of the Law of Corban, and accuses them *inter alia* of evil conversation, fornication, murder, blasphemy, pride (7.21f). The account of the feeding of the Four Thousand is followed by a challenge of His authority by the Pharisees who are 'asking for a sign from heaven tempting Him' (8.11f). Our Lord refuses to grant their request, uttering a 'God forbid', and crosses to the other side of the Sea of Galilee.

It is therefore significant to recall that in the Marcan accounts of demoniacal cures, the demons recognise our Lord (1.34) and submit to His authority in complete resignation, calling Him 'the Holy One of God' (1.24), 'Son of God most High' (5.8). The Gadarene demoniac 'ran and worshipped' Him (5.6). This total subjugation of the demonic world was not acknowledged by the Pharisees; instead, they accuse our Lord of being in collusion with Beelzebub.

When we follow the record of our Lord's experiences in the second part of Mark, we are confronted with the presence of Satan. Thus, Peter resists the idea of our Lord's suffering and

[1] Cf. Farrer's interpretation of the term *παρρησίᾳ*: *St. Mark*, p. 281; *St. Matthew and St. Mark*, p. 93.

death; and so our Lord rebukes him as Satan (8.33). The Pharisees raise the question of tribute money and Jesus retorts, 'Why tempt ye (πειράζετε) me? (12.15; cf. 1.13). Some of the people standing around the Cross invited Jesus to come down from the Cross 'in order than we may believe' (15.32; cf. Luke 4.9).

I think we could go on to apply this Satan-Conflict formula to the account of the death of John the Baptist in ch. 6. The setting is the mission of the Twelve who had gone out and 'proclaimed that men should repent. And they cast out many demons. . . .'

Herod hears of their activity and his attention is focused on Jesus. Who is He? John the Baptist redivivus? Or Elijah? Or one of the prophets?

Mark is presenting us, without saying so, with an account of a formidable conflict in which the parties involved are Herod representing Satan, the adversary of God and man, John the Baptist and Jesus. Satan's minions in this conflict are Herodias and her daughter reinforced by the fact of an oath taken in the presence of his noble guests. John the Baptist is killed by beheading and his disciples bury his headless body.

The story is however a sandwich of the account of the Mission and Return of the Twelve. What happens next is interesting. St. Mark tells us of the burial of John the Baptist and returns to the Twelve at the point where Jesus was inviting them to go away with him to the wilderness.

If then Mark intends us to see in the account of the death of John the Baptist the fierce onslaught of Satan, he also seems to wish us to understand that Jesus joined combat with Satan and ultimately won. But the battle was arduous.

Jesus first goes with His disciples to the wilderness. There was such a great traffic of people going to and fro that He and His disciples had no time to eat (6.31). Of course it was not the first time that Jesus was so busy teaching and healing that He had no time to eat bread. But probably the general pattern of the first Temptation as given in Q is implicit. 'Man does not live by bread alone.' So Jesus and His disciples kept themselves busy teaching the crowds and could not take time off for meals. On the other hand Jesus did multiply bread for the multitude but not out of stone. Strange as it might seem

there was some green grass in this wilderness. Our Lord was with men and women who were seeking to understand (?) the will of God and not with wild beasts as in 1.13.

Thus the contrast becomes clear and marked. Later on our Lord was to encounter the Cross and once again be exposed to Satan and suffer at the hands of the political and religious leaders[1] who represented him. But, at their worst, they could only kill Him physically. He died, but unlike John the Baptist He died intact and was buried whole, and God raised Him from the dead. Satan was discomfited *in toto* and God's victory became permanent. The strong man had been bound for ever and despoiled.

[1] Cf. 1 Thess. 2.14-16 where the Jews who killed Jesus are described as *not* pleasing God, and 'preventing us'—two marks of satanic initiative.

BOOK REVIEWS

Die Christliche Lehre von der Kirche, vom Glauben und von der Vollendung. Dogmatik, Band III. By Emil Brunner. Zwingli Verlag, Zürich and Stuttgart. Pp. 503. Sw. Fr. 37.50.

In the third and last volume of his Dogmatics Emil Brunner examines and discusses the Christian doctrine of Church, Faith and the final Consummation.

The Apostles, especially Paul, use the term *Ekklesia* christologically to mean not a gathering of people but the *klēsis*, the election and call of God in Christ. *Ekklesia* in the NT is therefore never an institution nor an *externum subsidium fidei* (Calvin) but is always the fellowship of those who are reconciled with God by God. This visible brotherhood of men in communion with God and with one another was gradually changed into what we call the 'Church' —an institution, a corporation in the legal sense. The Church is in varying degrees an aberration from the NT *Ekklesia* through the introduction of sacramentalism and juridical authority. The community of brothers has become—especially in the Roman Church—a community of partakers—partakers in the means of salvation (*Heilsgut*) dispensed by the priest. No Church today is the *Ekklesia* of the NT in spite of the efforts of the Reformers to that end. Yet all Churches, since they believe in Jesus Christ and acknowledge Him as their Lord, have served as the instrument and shell of the *Ekklesia* and in keeping the Word of Christ alive have provided the framework within which the real brotherhood in Christ may come into being.

Since *Ekklesia* and faith are inseparable the crisis of the Church can only be overcome by a fresh understanding of what the NT means by *pistis*. Just as the *Ekklesia* became the 'Church' so faith became orthodoxy, belief in doctrine (*Lehrglaube*) for the misconception of the one was bound to lead to the misunderstanding of the other and vice versa. *Pistis* in the NT is never assent to correct doctrine but simply faith in Jesus and acknowledgment of His authority whereby a man's life is transformed since he belongs no longer to himself but to God. The Pauline doctrine of justification (especially Rom. 3.21-31) is the real centre and climax of the Christian message. In justification *fides quae creditur* and *fides qua creditur*, the self-communication of God (objective) and the self-understanding of man (subjective), become identical. A recognition of this identity in justification would help to resolve the differences which have marked post-Reformation theology to the present day.

Justification by faith is God's personal promise (*Zuspruch*) in which in spite of *my* sin He addresses me as His beloved son, a promise I may and must believe because it is grounded in the reconciliation of His Son Jesus Christ. Although the NT term *pistis* has become misunderstood as meaning belief in doctrine, yet this 'belief in doctrine' is in fact the vessel of the true *pistis* into which it may be transformed if doctrine is witness to Jesus Christ.

Human life as the new being (*Sein*) created by Jesus Christ may be characterised by three basic NT words: faith, love, hope. In faith we are apprehended by Christ and apprehend Him. Through faith God communicates to us His own life which is love. This love—the fruit of faith—is not yet fully matured in us but rather is like a bud. The looking forward to that which is to come—the perfect self-communication of God—is hope. Hope can scarcely be distinguished from faith for we believe in Christ whose glory we beheld although it is still hidden under the *contraria species* of the Cross. Through the experience of the presence of Christ in the Holy Spirit the *Ekklesia* recognises itself as the new humanity in and through Christ. But the *Ekklesia* also knows that it possesses only the *aparchē*, the firstfruit, and not yet the full harvest. In faith there is no contradiction between the final judgment and universal grace, for we leave the dimension of 'is there such and such a thing?' and 'can it be connected logically with another?' and enter the dimension of 'this concerns me'. The moment we realise that judgment and grace affect us personally we know that the claim of God is changed into His promise in that the righteousness of Christ takes the place of the righteousness we lack. The final consummation—understood christologically—is not man's bliss but the realisation of God's will and glorification. At the same time this theocentrism, since it is theanthropocentrism, is the realisation of what man was destined for: his humanisation.

Emil Brunner provides us in his *Dogmatik* III with a brilliant analysis of the NT *Ekklesia* and the NT meaning of *pistis*. His conclusion that no 'Church' is identical with the *Ekklesia* and that intellectual assent to correct doctrine is not 'faith' is not contested by anyone who stands in the Reformed tradition. Since Brunner admits, however, that the 'Church' and 'belief in doctrine' provide the framework within which *Ekklesia* and *pistis* may come into being, one is left at a loss as to the positive measures he desires. Brunner himself says that what is to be deplored is not the existence of different Churches but the failure to recognise that the *Ekklesia* is a spiritual brotherhood.

But is this criticism really justified? Does the ecumenical Movement not bear witness to the fact that the *Ekklesia* is a spiritual

brotherhood by insisting on our oneness in Christ regardless of any particular Church affiliation? But there is one more serious criticism to be made. Brunner holds the introduction of sacramentalism responsible for the perversion and corruption of the *Ekklesia*. Not only the word but also the concept of sacrament is according to him alien to the NT. 'Modern man'—he writes—'does not understand a Church which on the one hand baptises indiscriminately every infant declaring him to be a member of the body of Christ and on the other proclaims justification by faith alone.' Baptism and Lord's Supper are never means of communicating salvation. 'They must bring us in faith into the presence of the living and risen Lord who communicates Himself to us in Baptism and the Supper in a special way and gives us His grace.' These are important and weighty assertions but proof that they are true is lacking. Does the effectiveness of Baptism and the Lord's Supper depend on human faith? Are they not primarily *opera Dei*? Instead of passing references to the Sacraments and a very short excursus on Infant Baptism one would have hoped for a full chapter on the NT concept of Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

It would be ungracious, however, to conclude on a critical note. Emil Brunner's latest contribution to theological thought will help us to take seriously the Reformed principle: *ecclesia reformata semper reformanda*. We rejoice that Emil Brunner was able to finish his *Dogmatics* in spite of many difficulties (cf. Preface) and has thus achieved what must be the ambition of every theologian.

RUDOLF J. EHRLICH

Anselm: Fides quaerens intellectum. By KARL BARTH. S.C.M. Press, London, 1960. Pp. 173. 25s.

THIS is one of Barth's most important works—far more important than may appear at first sight. He himself described it in the preface to the first edition as 'a model piece of good, penetrating and neat theology'. (On p. 9 of the translation various circumstances—notably the rendering of *Urheber* by 'author' instead of 'originator'—combine to give the impression that this refers to Anselm. But in fact Barth is speaking of his own book—with, of course, that characteristic mischievous gleam in his eyes.) He has more than once spoken of it to the present reviewer as his finest work, and expressed surprise and disappointment at the neglect it has suffered in some quarters. In the preface to the second edition he even goes so far as to call it 'a vital key, if not *the* key' to his whole theological approach (p. 11). It is true, of course, that a man is not always the best judge of his own work, and for that reason such remarks as these might be regarded with a certain suspicion. Yet the careful

student of this book is hardly likely to find much cause to disagree with them.

Here we have not merely one great theologian taking the measure of another. That in itself would be interesting enough. But in addition to that we are here shown one great theologian clarifying and crystallising, in conversation with another, his own ideas as to the nature of theology and of the theologian's task. It is not that Anselm is used merely as a foil. We are introduced to him for his own sake, and given a brilliant interpretation of his principles that can stand on its own account and will not easily be controverted. But the discerning reader will soon recognise that Barth's understanding of Anselm's principles is at the same time also his understanding of the principles of theology as such. Whatever marginal queries he might have, and however differently he might prefer to express himself in another context, he is in fact essentially in agreement with Anselm—or at all events with Anselm as he understands him, if that is not the same thing. Thus in a real sense the book is a statement of his own principles in Anselmian terms, and as such could have been of great help to those who found themselves perplexed by his more usual ways of stating them. At any rate, closer attention to it would certainly have forestalled many of the wilder criticisms made of him in the thirties and sometimes heard even yet.

Today, thirty years later, it is still an important book. It could well be commended as a useful 'introduction to Barth'—often much more useful than one would expect—while to the student of his historical development it is practically indispensable. But it can be specially valuable also in the context of contemporary welcomes to the 'new Barth'. For it can show that much of the so-called 'newness' is at least thirty years old, and that the recent changes are far more in context and emphasis than in essential outlook. The 'new Barth' indeed can as easily become a caricature as did the 'old' one—more welcome in many quarters, no doubt, but for all that a caricature. This book can help us to see that if the old picture of the truculent misanthropist was absurd, that of the suddenly repentant humanitarian is equally so.

The appearance at long last of an English version is a great event. It is only a pity that the enthusiasm of our welcome should be damped a little by the mixed quality of the translation. Alongside many excellent renderings there are a number of unhappy errors. Even the slightest inaccuracy is liable to be troublesome in such a carefully and closely argued book as this, and it is to be hoped that the translation will be thoroughly checked for the second edition. But of course the errors in question are only in matters of detail: they introduce a note of obscurity here and there, but leave the

general sense reasonably clear. Taken as a whole this translation meets a very real need. English readers will have many reasons to be grateful for it. And the S.C.M. Press are to be warmly congratulated on their enterprise in making it available.

JAMES W. LEITCH

John Calvin: the Man and his Ethics. By GEORGIA HARKNESS. Abingdon Press (Apex Books). Pp. 266. $1.50.

How does a reviewer deal with a book which he believes starts out from the wrong premises, pursues an erring course and reaches largely mistaken conclusions? The clue lies in the date of the book. It is the re-issue of a publication of 1931. The first sentence in this review is a measure of the altered climate in Calvin studies. In 1931 one thought of Calvin as the theologian of the sovereignty of God, predestination in its more repellant philosophical form, as the precursor of capitalism and the bourgeois spirit. This book, able enough in itself, reproduces such an outlook. In fact, it must surely have been out of date even in 1931. The great Calvin scholars of the past did not write like this. Karl Holl, B. B. Warfield, A. Lang and the others would never have perpetrated a chapter on his theology in which the person and work of Christ are virtually ignored, and in which His ethics is based on the Ten Commandments. The book therefore represents an archaism; it is a dismal hangover from the nineteenth century.

T. H. L. PARKER

Jesus als Mensch. By HEINRICH SUSO BRAUN. Ars Sacra, Munich, 1960. Pp. 56. DM. 5.20.

HEINRICH SUSO BRAUN, Capuchin Friar, religious broadcaster and ecumenically minded theologian, has written a fine study of the Life of Jesus. In the pages of this little book we meet Jesus the Man—a man so utterly human 'that He is really far closer to us than many a saint'. In simple but forceful language Braun shows us Jesus whose 'character had not one single effeminate or weak trait'. Braun's account is biblical and where he uses his imagination it is kept in check by the Gospels.

Braun knows that in the last resort no biography can give us the whole Christ. 'I should like to say'—Braun writes with reference to his portrait of Jesus—'this is the Saviour! But I dare not. . . . Yet I hope I have neither falsified nor concealed anything. Or have I? In my description of the Saviour's human character I have deliberately disregarded His divinity. But if the pages which speak . . . of His divinity were removed from the Gospels, nothing would remain but a number of unconnected stories and parables . . . the

portrait of a man, who . . . could not have existed. Yet He did—as the God-Man.' Braun thus recognises that the real Jesus is always the *Theanthropos* in whom the unity of the Son of God and the Son of man is fully realised, a mystery to which we can bear witness but which we cannot describe.

Theologically Braun's *Jesus als Mensch* is valuable because the author, withstanding the docetic tendencies of Roman christology, takes the humanity of our Lord seriously.

RUDOLF J. EHRLICH

Züricher Bibelkommentare: Das Buch Jesaja, 1. Band, Kap. 1.23. By GEORG FOHRER. Zwingli Verlag, Zürich and Stuttgart, 1960. Pp. 244. Sw. Fr. 10.80.

THE Zürich Bible Commentaries correspond in style and aim to the popular Torch Series. This volume covering the first twenty-three chapters of Isaiah is by Georg Fohrer, Professor at Vienna.

The translation reproduces the verse form of the original where it is used, and each passage is given an appropriate heading descriptive of its content, followed by an exposition printed in different type. Where necessary, footnotes are added explaining unusual words, proper names, puns, ancient usages and occasional emendations to the text. But the reader is not overburdened with these. The whole arrangement of text and exposition makes the commentary easy to follow and convenient for reference.

The introduction gives a sketch of Isaiah's life which Professor Fohrer divides into four main periods: (*a*) From his call to 736 B.C.; (*b*) The time of the Syro-Ephraimitic War, 735-733 B.C.; (*c*) From the accession of Hezekiah to the failure of his attempt to assert the independence of Judah, 716-711 B.C.; (*d*) The last attempt of Hezekiah to win independence, 705-701 B.C.

Actually, in Professor Fohrer's opinion, 'Only a small number of the passages in the book can with any certainty be attributed to him' (p. 1). At the same time he does not like the application of the words 'not genuine' to non-Isaianic sayings, with their implication of lesser value, whilst in fact the value of a prophetic word depends on its content and not on its author. Presumably prophets, like Homer, may nod.

Professor Fohrer places the call of Isaiah at the beginning of the book and, as others have done, takes the Prophet's vision of God in the Temple to refer to the heavenly Temple and not the Temple in Jerusalem. This interpretation emphasising the transcendent holiness rather than the holy condescension of God affects his conception of the relation of God to history. The emphasis is on God's control and guidance of the process rather than on His action in it, and faith

is 'trust in God who guides the course of world events' (p. 98), rather than personal encounter with and response to His self-revelation in judgment and mercy in the witness and life of His Chosen People. Thus the Remnant passages are interpreted in terms of possible human action within the historical situation. Judah may become the Remnant if it returns to God. 'The name Shear Jashub has a note of exhortation rather than promise and refers to the fate of Judah which depends on the decision of the Judeans' (p. 96), rather than on a fresh initiative of God.

Professor Fohrer rightly emphasises the call of Isaiah as important for the interpretation of his message, which he regards wholly as prophecy of doom. 'The terrible threat of the divinely willed end of the guilt-laden existence of Israel runs through the preaching of the prophet in exalted and shattering monotony from his call (6.11) to his last words (1.4ff, 22.1ff and probably 32.9ff)' (p. 14). Yet it might be asked whether more should not be made of the fact that Isaiah, who indeed acknowledges a sense of doom and of belonging to a doomed people (6.5), nevertheless receives assurance of forgiveness, which in the context of his call to be a prophet and in view of the sense of corporate life in Israel cannot be taken as referring to himself alone but as holding promise for the People. It is possible that the traditional position of the narrative of Isaiah's call, before chapters 7 and 8 which deal with the Remnant, is appropriate and significant, suggesting that the mercy of God is effective not for the Prophet only, but includes those who receive his message, who in turn are a token and promise of the true Israel, the fruit of the divine election which cannot fail.

While taking up these special points for criticism one must not overlook the real merits of this book. Professor Fohrer makes the life and times of Isaiah very vivid, real and relevant to our own. This is done not by any sensational arts but by wide, sound and solid scholarship and knowledge of his subject allied with the ability to communicate it in a way that can appeal to and hold the common reader. Professor Fohrer has a gift for popular exposition and the decision and clarity with which he expresses his own view on difficult points of interpretation helps the reader to see the issues clearly and make up his own mind. This is an essential part of the commentator's task and here it is well done. J. C. Campbell

Hebrew Thought Compared with Greek Thought. By Thorlief Boman, tr. Jules L. Moreau. S.C.M. Press (The Library of History and Doctrine), London, 1960. Pp. 208 + indexes. 21s.

This volume is 'a comparison of the intellectual world of the Old Testament with the intellectual world of the Greek, principally of

the philosophers, and particularly that of Plato'. The study was first published in 1952. The present volume is a translation from the second edition (German) by Professor J. L. Moreau of Evanston, Illinois: but there are discussions on the problems of history and the concept of creation which are to be found only in this English edition. They are included in response to criticisms of the German edition on the grounds that some clarification was needed. The publisher's blurb says that the great Oslo scholar does not ask from his readers much previous linguistic equipment. On the contrary, the discussions of the significance of some Hebrew roots seem to this reviewer to demand considerable knowledge. Indeed expert Hebrew scholars will find a good deal they did not know before, and in some cases, if the author is right, they will have to reorientate some of their ideas. And further, in order to find this book easy reading, the reader will need a considerable knowledge of Hebrew, Greek, psychology and philosophy.

The main argument of the book is that Hebrew thought and Greek thought are not radically opposed to each other, but are complementary. In detail, the contrast between the Hebrew and Greek modes of thought is not between dynamic and static, but between movement and rest. He uses various Hebrew roots to show that motionless and fixed being is for the Hebrews a nonentity; it does not exist. Again, the Hebrew collective is equivalent to the Platonic idea in that the general comes first and the particular comes second (*ets* means 'wood' first, and 'tree' later as being made of wood). The Hebrew got it straight from his language, but Plato had a hard struggle to arrive at his abstraction. The author has an interesting comparison between Hebrew and Greek, in that the Greek is interested in the outward appearance, whereas the Hebrew wants to know how things are made. He is interested in qualities rather than appearance. The Hebrew thinks of things as instruments; the Greek as symbols. It will be realised that the author's field is wide, and his arguments varied.

There are two very valuable discussions in the book. The one is the meaning of the Hebrew verb *haya*; the other is a comparison of the Hebrew *dabhar* and the Greek *logos*. The Hebrew development is: drive forward—speak—WORD—Deed; the Greek development is: gather, arrange—speak, reckon, think—WORD—Reason. By way of conclusion, let the author speak for himself: 'If both are right [wave-theory of light and quantum theory], reality possesses opposite properties which complete each other. Bohr calls the unitariness of opposite manifestations of a phenomenon *complementarity*. In that sense, Hebrew and Greek thinking are complementary; the Greeks describe reality as *being*, the Hebrews as *movement*. Reality

is, however, both at the same time; this is logically impossible, and yet it is correct.' NORMAN H. SNAITH

The Four Gospels: an historical introduction. By MGR L. CERFAUX. Darton, Longman and Todd, London, 1960. Pp. 145. 9s. 6d.

THIS little book by an eminent Belgian Roman Catholic scholar will be a useful addition to the libraries of many ministers and others. It gives a vivid account in small compass of the early history of the Gospel tradition, both oral and written, and it has been well and vigorously done into English by Patrick Hepburne-Scott. It is perhaps a pity that the original French title has not been preserved, since Mgr Cerfaux's book does not only concern itself with the Four Gospels, but with the 'Living Voice' of the Gospel tradition in the early centuries. Chapters on the Apostolic Tradition and on each of the Four Gospels are followed by a brief account of the fourfold Gospel, with references to Tatian, Irenaeus, Origen and others; and after saying something of the apocryphal gospels and extra-canonical sayings of Jesus the book concludes with a chapter on Christian life under the sign of the Gospel. It is this firm planting of the Four Gospels within the framework of the whole Gospel tradition and of the life of the early Church that will make the book of especial value to British readers; there are not many books in English which do this in so readable a fashion.

The book will also be of interest in this country because it presents a theory of Gospel sources which will be new to those nourished on Streeter and his followers. Instead of building a structure on the twin pillars of Mark and Q, Cerfaux builds on a basic distinction, which appears in differing forms in the first three Gospels, between what may roughly be called Galilee sources and Jerusalem sources. This is not the same as the views of the late Ernst Lohmeyer; it is rather a distinction between the Gospel of Jesus the preacher of the Kingdom and the Gospel of Jesus the subject of the Kingdom, its inaugurator and its embodiment. This manner of expressing the distinction is of course an over-simplification; but perhaps enough has been said to show that we have here a stimulating and readable introduction to an approach to the synoptic problem different from that to which most of us are accustomed.

Cerfaux's account of the formation of the Gospel of Matthew will perhaps prove particularly interesting. Following the Vatican's Biblical Commission, he asserts the priority of Matthew over Mark; but the distinction between an original Aramaic Matthew (as suggested by Papias) and the final Greek version enables him to allow for some degree of literary dependence of Matthew on Mark. It cannot be asserted that he will convince the doubters here; perhaps

he could hardly be expected to do so within the space which he allows himself. Nor is he very happy in his handling of the problem constituted by Luke's use of Matthew and Mark respectively. He owes something, and acknowledges his debt, to the Form Critics; but it is a pity from the point of view of his British and non-Roman audience that so many of his controversial swipes are aimed at Loisy's *Birth of the Christian Religion*—a somewhat out-of-date object of attack, which never was of such great relevance here as on the continent of Europe.

But all in all this is a most useful and lively little book, which ought to find a wide audience in this country. Like all the writers of such books, Cerfaux can sometimes present sheer hypothesis as if it were fact—can we really assert that 'the transcription of the Aramaic memoirs into Greek was made at Jerusalem itself, in the presence of the Apostles, in the earliest days of the Christian Church' (p. 12)?—but he who reads with caution will find much to stimulate him, some things to provoke him, and scarcely a page on which he does not find something to attract his attention.

R. S. Barbour

The Gospels, their Origin and their Growth. By F. C. Grant. Faber and Faber, London, 1958. Pp. viii + 216. 21s.

On the jacket of this book the publishers quote Dr William Barclay's verdict on the American edition, which he described as 'quite the most important book on the Gospels that has appeared for a considerable time'. This is high praise, but abundantly justified. It is now more than thirty years since B. H. Streeter published his *Four Gospels*, and much has happened in the interval. Indeed the Form Criticism which has played so prominent a part in recent study had already made its appearance, at least in Germany, before Streeter wrote. There has been a real need for a full and up-to-date volume which would do for a new generation what Streeter did for the old, and this need is now admirably met. To say this is not of course to disparage such a book as Vincent Taylor's invaluable *Short Introduction*, which has deservedly passed through many editions. Nor is it to say that Streeter is now superseded, any more than Streeter's work superseded, for example, that of Hawkins. Professor Grant builds upon Streeter's foundation, as Streeter built upon the work of those who had gone before him; but at many points the researches of the past thirty years have rendered necessary some reconsideration. In broad outline the picture remains much the same, but on many details the modern scholar is able to speak with greater confidence and precision; and above all there has come into being a new approach to the Gospels as a whole.

Professor Grant is exacting in his requirements, and practically denies the right to pronounce on Gospel criticism to those who will not submit to the discipline and the drudgery of working through the material in meticulous detail; but if his prescription were adopted there would be less careless talk, and fewer fantastic theories. As he rightly says, a proper grasp of the subject is not to be achieved in a few months' study, but only by the patient labour of years. His own work bears on page after page the evidence of prolonged and minute scrutiny of the Gospel material.

The opening chapter vigorously defends the critical approach, in the proper sense of that much-abused phrase. 'It is only when the study of the Bible and its underlying sources . . . is related to and serves the ends of *the religious understanding of holy scripture* that its full value can be seen.' 'No criticism . . . can be "too radical" i.e. go too deeply into the roots of problems.' The New Testament is the Church's book, produced for the Church's defence, encouragement or consolation, and must be interpreted accordingly. The Gospels in particular rest not on the recollections, or the imaginations, of individuals but upon an underlying oral tradition which was the common property of the early Churches, and the basic trustworthiness of this tradition is beyond doubt precisely because it is the testimony of a group. The Church grew up not in isolation but 'in the full glare of publicity, in the great cities of the Roman Empire'.

The next three chapters are likewise mainly introductory, the second setting the New Testament as a whole in the context of the history of the early Church, the third ('Why we have Gospels') dealing with the reasons for delay in the first generation and the motives which prompted writing in the second and third; while the fourth is concerned with questions of method. The fifth chapter ('The Gospel before the Gospels') outlines the structure and contents of Q and L, and the sixth is devoted to the Order of the Gospels. Of the remaining chapters three are given to Mark, its structure and contents, and its sources, and one to each of the others, Luke being considered earlier than Matthew. It is quite evident that Professor Grant's sympathies lie mainly with Luke, who 'brings us closest, of all the gospel writers, to the Jesus of history who is also the Lord of the church's faith'. Mark he characterises as a somewhat cold and unimaginative Roman Christian who made the most he could of his resources, arranging his materials in the order that best suited his purposes and the needs of the Church in his day. Matthew is 'a Christian scribe—one might almost say a converted rabbi', John perhaps a 'converted' Gnostic, but it is the two-volume work of Luke (some half a dozen pages are given to Acts) which is

at once the most extensive and the most valuable writing in the New Testament.

It is scarcely necessary to say that in a work of this scale there are numerous points on which disagreement is possible. For example, Professor Grant follows Burkitt and Rendel Harris in the view that the *logia* referred to by Papias are to be interpreted not of a collection of sayings such as Q but of OT prophecies, and he says that *logia* and *logoi* are two entirely different words. As it happens, Lightfoot-Harmer (1891 edition) gives *logiōn kuriakōn* as part of the title of Papias' own work, but *logōn* in paragraphs 14 and 15 of H.E. iii.39. Did Papias use *logia* or *logoi* of Mark? Reference to the Berlin Corpus volume of Eusebius shows that the latter reading does have MS. support, although apparently weaker, and in any case there are still some who would maintain that by *logia* Papias meant sayings of Jesus.

Again, some will differ on the subject of the Hellenistic and Gnostic background of the Fourth Gospel. The parallels in the Dead Sea Scrolls are here described as 'really minor and only "more of the same" ' in comparison with the vast array of parallels in Hellenistic religious literature. This may, however, be a necessary corrective to over-enthusiastic estimates. On the other hand many would agree that there is little room for the Mandean hypothesis, although even here some will differ. And is Irenaeus' emphasis upon four Gospels only, neither more nor less, directed against 'Valentinus' new *Gospel of Truth*'? Irenaeus surely knew more apocryphal Gospels than this.

Finally, Professor Grant may be right in rejecting the theory of Aramaic original Gospels, but how far is this now maintained by the 'Aramaic experts'? If memory serves, the most recent studies have followed rather the line of 'the main thesis, viz. that the traditional sources of the gospels at one time circulated orally in Aramaic', which Professor Grant himself declares to be 'far more probable'.

The 'selected bibliography' provides enough material to keep the most voracious bookworm busy for a very long time. Even so, it is surprising to find no reference to Beasley-Murray's study of the Little Apocalypse theory, or to the works of Dodd and Jeremias on the parables; Stendahl's *School of St. Matthew* and Doeve's *Jewish Hermeneutics* might also have their relevance to certain specific subjects here discussed. And it is somewhat irritating for the reader to be constantly referred to Harper's Annotated Bible Series for fuller treatment, when the volumes may not be readily accessible.

In the last resort, however, these and other criticisms do not affect the value of this book, which must surely provide the starting-

point for further advance in the study of the Gospels. The one error noted, on p. 159, produces the statement: 'the bare historical data of his outward life fade almost *into significance*' (italics mine).

R. McL. Wilson

St. John's Gospel: an Exposition. By Walther Lüthi, tr. Kurt Schoenenberger. Oliver and Boyd, Edinburgh and London, 1960. Pp. x + 348. 25s.

In a recent issue of the *Scottish Journal of Theology* Professor T. F. Torrance inveighed against the cult of personality in preaching. And rightly so: it is not an unknown phenomenon for the personality of the preacher to obscure the Person of Christ. This is dreadful. By such 'popular preaching' the pulpit is dishonoured. But there is a popular preaching of a very different kind, where throngs gather round the Word not because the preacher's personality obtrudes or fascinates, not because his idiosyncracies or genius grips them, but precisely because they are seeing past him altogether to the Christ of whom he speaks. This was true of Phillips Brooks and F. W. Robertson, of John Kelman and Arthur Gossip. It is supremely true of Walter Lüthi, one of the most popular preachers—in the best sense—on the Continent of Europe today. The crowds that waited upon his ministry in Basel and now throng the Münster in Berne are drawn not by the magnetism of magnificent exposition, though that undoubtedly is present, but by the constraint of Christ veritably present in the Word in judgment and in mercy.

It is a matter for gratification that Lüthi's great *Johannes: Das vierte Evangelium ausgelegt für die Gemeinde* has now appeared in an English edition, well translated by Kurt Schoenenberger and excellently produced by Messrs Oliver and Boyd. Those who look to this book for an excursus on Johannine 'problems'—literary, historical, critical—may certainly be disappointed. These matters of technical 'Introduction' Dr Lüthi leaves alone, perhaps almost too severely alone. Yet it is salutary occasionally to come across a volume that takes this line: for multitudes of New Testament studies today, not designating themselves 'Introduction', are nevertheless precisely that and never begin to come in sight of the real thing about which the New Testament is talking. To deny the importance of Introduction would, of course, be foolish obscurantism. Anything is bound to be important, nothing can be superfluous, that bears even remotely on the fundamental documents of the faith. But let us preserve some sense of proportion here. I have read in a book on the Pauline epistles that an understanding of the essential message of Galatians depends on a prior decision on the north-south destination controversy. This is

nonsense. It is pernicious nonsense—for it helps to foster the disastrous idea that the function of New Testament study is being properly fulfilled by the kind of argument and debate that would be valid for the investigation of the unity of Homer or the diction of Shakespeare. Sometimes one can read hundreds of pages about New Testament Christianity and hardly feel any stirring of that wind of the Spirit, that waft of the supernatural, which when one opens the New Testament itself blows full in one's face. What makes this book of Dr Lüthi such an authentic piece of biblical interpretation is that something of that wind blows through every page. In the long history of Johannine exposition, there can have been few volumes as bracing and refreshing and invigorating as this.

The situation in which these sermons were originally delivered —during the War, in the frontier town of Basel 'on the edge of the crater'—has doubtless left its imprint on them. It has certainly not diminished by one iota their appositeness for the present hour. Quite the contrary. The great panorama of the Fourth Gospel is here seen to have a quite startling relevance for the predicament and bewilderment of this nuclear age, for the mission of the Church to a secularised society, and for the quest of individual souls fighting with loneliness, wrestling with doubt, battered by temptation, or half paralysed by the uncertainties of the future. Hear Lüthi himself: 'Is the Word that was in the beginning not valid now? Is the Redeemer any the less a Redeemer because the spirit of Christmas is lacking in the world today? Must He who was before the storm began to rage go with the wind that happens to be blowing?' (p. 7).

How forthright these expositions are may be gauged from the following: 'It is quite extraordinary how many people I have met in the past week who have been discussing Christ for years, with no result, and who are sinking ever deeper into a quagmire of argument and speculation. I should like to take them by the scruff of the neck, and shake them and say, "For goodness' sake, stop this chattering about Christ and take one little step, however diffident or even laughably small it may be, along His path. One inch in this direction is worth more than a thousand miles of discussion about Him" ' (p. 98). Or again: 'I am told that it is a criminal offence to pour water into the petrol tank of a motor car, because it stops the engine. But that is precisely what has happened in the Western Church. We have poured water into the fuel-tanks of the Church and have remained miserably stuck; and thus we have adulterated and watered down the Gospel' (p. 329). There is no dichotomy here between exegesis and exposition, or between *didache* and *kerygma*:

the dominant aim of the Gospel—'These are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through His name' (20.31)—is kept in view throughout. 'If there is one man here today who feels that he would like to get up and walk out because his life seems impossibly bungled, and who sees no hope of changing, to him I should like to say that the Good Shepherd, that true master of the lost sheep, has been waiting for him, in particular, until this very day. This Shepherd, who seeks what is lost, did not Himself become one of the lost for nothing' (p. 134). The unity of Christ's Church is a burning concern: 'Anyone who does not believe in the unity of the Church because there are still many churches, is like the madman who does not believe in the Resurrection of Christ because there is still death' (p. 271). Above all, Lüthi glories in the accomplished work of Christ: 'Suppose it really were true, as a scientist recently stated, that "the capacity for faith is rapidly diminishing in the present generation". What if this capacity for faith should shrink to almost nothing? Has God founded His cause on earth on our capacity for faith, or on the work that Christ accomplished for us?' (p. 239).

This is a book to read and to re-read. It is not unworthy of the Johannine Gospel which is its theme.

James S. Stewart

The Historicity of the Fourth Gospel. By A. J. B. Higgins. Lutterworth Press, London, 1960. Pp. 83. 6s. 6d.

'It is still almost axiomatic in some quarters,' writes Dr Higgins, 'that John's Gospel is so thoroughly interpretative that it contains little or nothing of genuine historical value.' On the other hand he can quote T. W. Manson as saying, 'The question of the historical value of the Fourth Gospel is wide open again', and many scholars in recent years, including C. H. Dodd, J. A. T. Robinson and J. E. Davey, to name no others, have urged that concentration upon the Synoptics to the neglect of John must deprive us of important evidence. The problem is to discover what in the Fourth Gospel is interpretation, what genuine primitive tradition.

Dr Higgins believes, with Gardner-Smith, that John is independent of the synoptics, but argues that he was familiar with traditions at points similar to theirs, and that the sources or traditions used by the fourth evangelist deserve at least as much respect as those employed by the Synoptists. The book is based on lectures delivered in 1959 in Canada and the U.S.A., and provides a convenient conspectus of recent literature on the subject, although in rejecting Mlle Jaubert's theory on the date of the Last Supper the

author overlooks Dr George Ogg's critique in *Novum Testamentum* (iii (1959)k 149ff). One's chief complaint is that of Oliver Twist: we should like some more. Eighty pages is scarcely enough for such a subject; or is it that the title seems to promise more than is given? In so small a compass there is room to deal only with a few passages, where the title might lead one to expect a study of the Gospel as a whole. What is here offered is, however, excellent, although some points are open to debate, and the documentation provides a useful guide to recent discussion. R. McL. Wilson

Paul. His Life and Work. By Walther von Loewenich. Oliver and Boyd, Edinburgh, 1960. Pp. 160. 15s.

There is a constant need for books which will make the life and thought of the great figures of the Bible more easily understood by the untechnical reader and will set them in their context. This Professor von Loewenich of Erlangen has here attempted with some success to do for Paul. His account of his life is lucid with adequate geographical, historical, literary and other Jewish and Greek background, and a knowledge of technical terms is not assumed in the reader. To this is added a survey of the Pauline letters in which the content of each is delineated, and as opportunities occur key thoughts in Paul's theology are expounded. Here is much knowledge relevantly introduced and an exposition which lays bare Paul's argument again and again. Yet for one reader at least the book did not come alive.

This may be partly due to the generally fluent translation, which does not always succeed in muffling an elephantine Germanic tread . . . 'all scientific judgments . . . are subject to vicissitudes' (p. 8) . . . 'on the contrary it was actually' (p. 12). But the didacticism of some passages can come only from the original (on casuistry at p. 26, on the canon at p. 95, on chapter divisions at p. 99), as must the awkwardness of the phrase 'the facts are still, despite numerous difficulties, very easily ascertained'. But Mr Harris, despite some loosely used prepositions and a fondness for 'epitomise', has handled his work well.

More serious is the author's failure in several passages to distinguish letter and epistle: on p. 26f the different meanings of Torah might have been mentioned: the treatment of Judaism is considerably less than generous: 'Lengthy pauses in dictation' becomes almost a *Leitmotif* in the later pages of the book: the Galatian question and the relation of Acts and Galatians is raised but not thoroughly considered.

But its greatest weakness, in Britain, as a book designed to interest and support lay piety (hence the didacticism cheek by jowl with

occasional sermonic lyricism), is that it is a product of its own milieu to a degree amounting almost to parochialism. Luther, who in the prologue has occupied the centre of the stage, is thereafter always lurking in the wings and makes over twenty appearances by name (once on p. 131 for criticism!) and others incognito. Calvin is finally unmasked as villain at p. 141. But we wonder if Paul was really the first Lutheran. H. A. SHEPHERD

An Introduction to the Great Creeds of the Church. By PAUL T. FUHRMANN. The Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1960. Pp. 144. $3.00.

PROFESSOR FUHRMANN's aim is 'to introduce the principal creeds by which the Church in its various ages and ways, has confessed its faith', in such a way 'as to set forth only their dominant ideas, their origin and their significance for modern times'. Seven creeds or confessional statements—the Apostles', the Nicene, the Athanasian, the Waldensian Declarations of Faith, the Augsburg Confession, the Gallican Confession of 1559 and the Westminster Confession—are selected and all given separate chapters in which the author, briefly and in popular vein, reconstructs the circumstances which led to their formulation. Chapters II and III for example, are little more than outlines of certain aspects of the history of early Christianity; chapter IX a survey of English Protestantism to the time of the Westminster Assembly, and chapter VI a brief but interesting one on the little-known history of the Waldensian Church to 1532. A chapter entitled 'The Role of the Creeds in the High Medieval Church' bridges the gap between the early Church and the Reformation period. Pastoral interest and devotion to Calvin's theology stands out clearly in the conclusion where Professor Fuhrmann pleads for the retention of the creeds as guaranteeing due respect for the Word of God. He is, however, prepared to allow the Church freedom to add new statements of policy and beliefs in terms understandable by the common people of today, provided the historical continuity of Christianity and of Protestantism is preserved and kept vital.

The general reader, for whom this book is primarily intended, will be grateful for this readable presentation of material not readily available to him. It is, however, regretted that in its preparation more use has not been made of works of detailed scholarship, and that by over-simplification the author has made way for inaccuracies; to give one example only, on p. 111 he states that Charles I planned 'to re-establish the episcopate (abolished in Scotland since 1592) and force the Anglican Prayer Book on the Scots'. The Heidelberg Catechism is not mentioned or the Thirty-Nine Articles discussed.

The book does not come up to the expectations aroused by the title nor does it do justice to the author's splendid aim.

JAMES K. CAMERON

Saint Irénée: Introduction à l'étude de sa théologie. By ANDRÉ BÉNOÎT. Presses Universitaires de France (Études d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses, published under the auspices of the Protestant Faculty of Theology in the University of Strasbourg), 1960. Pp. 256. N.fr. 14.00.

IT is virtually a truism that, with the exception of the earliest and latest generations, Protestants have tended to under-emphasise Patristics in favour of biblical theology. This is particularly true of those influenced by the enthusiastic tradition, and is in major contrast to 'Catholic' tradition, whether Roman, Eastern Orthodox, or High Anglican, and to the sort of extreme Liberal who regards one thing as being as good as another, or worse, as the Irishman is supposed to have said. The reason is obvious. To one who values 'tradition', it is a matter of vital importance whether, say, Athanasius taught the *Filioque* or Irenaeus the Papal Supremacy. No Protestant can possibly have the same interest in the Fathers, even if he does not accept the conclusion of his more extreme brethren that the great apostasy of the Church already dated from A.D. 100. Thus Patristics has tended to become a Catholic interest, and this has had the effect of confirming the great split in theology and the Church. Whatever we think of the rights and wrongs of the case, we must admit that its effects on disinterested scholarship, ecumenical relations, and the ability of the Church to understand and react to novel situations, has been disastrous. For that reason, this book on Irenaeus, by the son of the well-known Calvin scholar, who comes from a family that has contributed much to the French Reformed Church, arouses great expectations. This is so not only for the above reasons but also because of the great intrinsic importance of Irenaeus himself. As Professor Bénoît himself says, in his final paragraph, both episcopalian, traditionalist, and papalist Catholics, and biblicist Protestants, can alike claim him as their own; he shows, for the first time, unmistakable signs of a credal method; we find in him the foundations of the later classical theology and christology; and he still remains, *par excellence*, the theologian of Christianity-and-History.

The writer has rendered one supremely important service; he has shown that the tremendous emphasis in Irenaeus on the New Humanity, etc., which is often considered to be the decisive feature of Irenaeus, is really the corollary of his christology, in the best Barthian fashion, and is not to be considered as being on the same

plane as his doctrine of God, which is regarded, quite rightly, as the primary interest of Irenaeus. But in many other respects the reviewer does not find his expectations fulfilled. Although the author sets out to write a comprehensive study of Irenaeus, he finds it impossible, owing to space, to treat fully the theology of Irenaeus, and has to leave it to a later book. His topics are: a critical survey of recent scholarship, Irenaeus's general and cultural background, his use of the Old and New Testaments, a literary analysis of the *Adversus Haereses*, its themes (Les Thèmes), and the same repeated for the 'Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching'. The 'thèmes' are treated in a highly formal and categorical way although 'thème' can also mean a *locus theologicus*), the major emphasis being on the theme of Unity in its various manifestations. The book may be regarded as the prolegomena to a definitive study of Irenaeus, and as such it is of great value to the student; one can argue that its defects will automatically correct themselves when its necessary sequel appears. But unfortunately the book contains many deficiencies which are not of the self-correcting kind, and the subject is so important that they must be noted at once.

Perhaps the most decisive mistake of Professor Bénoît was made in the very first chapter. He quite rightly castigates the source-critical school of Loofs, which he characterises as the method of the post-mortem room, and he finds the more modern form-critical school little better; we must, after giving these aspects their due, get behind them to Irenaeus the man, the *Gestalt*. Unfortunately, there is too much of M. Raymond Aron and a contemporary academic and historical fashion, and not enough of the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church witnessing to its Lord; too much of the old familiar romantic individualism as distinct from the liberty of the Spirit who proceeds from Father *and Son*. The effect of this is that in spite of his professed intention the author still remains essentially in the school of Loofs. The picture of Irenaeus is that of an intellectually second-rate man who follows in the footsteps of received tradition with dog-like devotion, and whose *magnum opus* (?) is a patchwork of sources from the Apologists, men like Papias (e.g. the eschatological section), and others not known for certain, and whose knowledge of the Bible and of contemporary culture is adequate but quite routine. Do I detect here the old secularist idea that Christianity is not a subject of academic interest? as if God does not vouchsafe a full intellectual reward to those that love Him with all their *mind*! On the other point, it is true that the *Adversus Haereses* shows signs of being put together from portions of other works. At any rate, this is the usual deduction from the presumed fact that here and there Irenaeus will get on to an issue,

treat it for a while, and before he has finished it change his subject sharply. Let it be granted that Irenaeus, not being a romantic individualist, does sometimes use sources; granted, too, that there are signs of discontinuity in his works. But this is so in all the Fathers, and nowhere perhaps more so than in the First Apology of Justin, the very Justin whom the writer compares so favourably to Irenaeus in this regard. In other places, the writer accepts, too uncritically, the traditional Catholic line, thus underplaying his hand. May there not be a strong case for interpreting Irenaeus in a genuinely Reformed way? Professor Bénoît admits that Irenaeus's argument for accepting Luke and Acts (we accept Luke's Gospel because of his connexion with the Apostle Paul, as testified in Acts, and the testimony of Acts because it is a sequel to Luke) is circular, and that the argument that there must be exactly four Gospels on the analogy of the cardinal points of the compass has nothing much to do with the case. But, apart altogether from the question of whether these are simply arguments *ad homines*, may not their very illogicality be a sign that Irenaeus is not happy about saying what Catholic theologians, and Professor Bénoît, assume that he has to say, that is, Scripture is canonical simply because the Church says so? After all, the question of Scripture and tradition is not easy even now, and it is child's play compared with what it would have been like in the second century.

But the principal defect of the book, which makes it finally impossible to see the unity and the greatness of Irenaeus, is the writer's failure to appreciate that, at any rate after a certain stage of the *Adversus Haereses*, the principal enemy becomes Marcion. Indeed, we often underestimate the extent to which this applied even to the Apologists, a simple explanation, by the way, for Irenaeus's apparent use of them as sources. Marcion was the first great heretic, and almost certainly the worst. It is most doubtful whether even Arius can take this dishonour from him. Compared with him, Valentinus and his Gnostic system was a huge joke, which afforded Irenaeus much-needed comic relief from the serious business of life; the same applies to Basilides and the rest of them, while people like Simon Magus and Marcus the Magician were, as their names imply, public clowns. But heresy ceases to be funny when we come to Marcion. Because he represented a practical heresy of the gravest kind, in that, when he postulated an absolute dichotomy between a New Testament 'good god' who redeems without creating, and an Old Testament god of sheer brute force who created the world and created it evil, and was responsible for the Crucifixion, he thereby raised two of the most urgent issues of faith and life: the Wrath of God in relation to His Love, and the issue classically formulated by

Francis Bacon when he said that prosperity was the blessing of the Old Testament and adversity of the New. The fact that such a heresy arose at all suggests that something had gone wrong with the Church, and the evidence screams for eschatology. Or rather something in the complex comprising eschatology, the Church's task, and the sufferings of the present age, as well might happen in a Church under persecution, something which nobody seems to consider as a formative influence on theology.

When we adopt these hypotheses, a lot in Irenaeus that is otherwise obscure or even nonsensical comes into sharp focus. The *Adversus Haereses*, instead of being a patchwork, becomes one of the most tightly integrated works in the history of theology. Surely, if God is God of all creation and not just of the existential part of man, we must look forward to Christ's coming again in such a way that there is no question of His own receiving Him not. Our own experience with Bultmann should have been sufficient warning of the intimate connexion between eschatology and the Doctrine of God the Creator. This is why the eschatological portions of the *Adversus Haereses*, which Professor Bénoît almost regards as almonds on a cake, are where they are. For the same reason, the apostolic witness, the life of the Church, and the growth of Christian manhood must represent a continuity which not only points back to Christ's First Advent but forward to His Second Advent. It must also be antecedently continuous with the prophetic witness to Christ in the Old Testament. This continuity of witness is most important in Irenaeus, and is very intimately associated with the Holy Spirit, although his emphasis is, for *ad hominem* reasons, very much on the Old Testament.

As he was preparing this review, a suspicion crossed the reviewer's mind that there might be something wrong with the general run of contemporary Neo-Reformation theology, which is somehow linked with the author's failure to appreciate Irenaeus fully. When we ask the question, 'What was the Reformation about?' or 'Why are you not a Roman Catholic?' the acceptable answer today is that the essential primary issue is the absolute supremacy of the Word of God, in all its senses, for revelation and salvation. Yet, if the average layman is asked this question, he is just as likely to talk about the ostentatious unworldliness of the celibate and monastic orders, or, in an apparently contradictory way, about the tendency of the Roman Catholic Church, at other levels, to have too much to do with political and social life. At a higher level of sophistication he might refer to the Papal and episcopal forms of the Apostolic Succession, and the contrast between spiritual freedom and ecclesiastical authoritarianism. Now,

the interesting thing is that these are the very two subjects that are so prominent in Irenaeus. The second issue has been already discussed. The former type of answer patently refers to the detailed, delicate, and difficult compromise which the Church finally evolved to deal with the problem of world-acceptance and world-renunciation as posed by the Gnostics and Marcionites. The tendency of Protestant laymen to give these sorts of answer is usually taken as a sign of theological naïveté, but one begins to wonder whether they may not be in their own way right. After all, Luther's first act as a Reformer was, in its polemical aspect, directed not only against *de facto* Pelagianism but also against monasticism, and one of the main results of the Reformation was to throw once again into the melting pot the whole compromise between world-acceptance and world-renunciation that the medieval Church had adopted and which, as Luther saw, did not meet the case. As to the other matter, it is no use denying that the Reformers were taking, with their eyes open, grave risks with the visible unity and continuity of the Church. Therefore, they would have had to face the question of continuity as a primary issue, as is obvious when we read Calvin's *Institutes* without skipping his anti-Romanist chapters. These questions could not be avoided: 'Is it possible for a Church to be in apostasy and heresy, even if it is in institutional and "apostolic" continuity, and enjoys in fact a monopoly?' 'If the answer to the former question is yes, in what way is the Church truly Apostolic and apostolically continuous, and what is our next step in this situation?' Although these are the questions that Irenaeus rejects or does not consider, they are in another sense right on his subject matter. Thus, it appears that the Reformation was not just about *one* fundamental issues, but *three*; what is even more interesting is the fact that it works out at one per Person of the Trinity, which suggests that it may be one issue in a Trinitarian form!

For this reason alone, modern Reformation theology ignores or depreciates Irenaeus at its peril. But there is an even more serious reason. Marcionitism was a convulsive shock to the Church, from which it has never really recovered its balance and poise. It is the easiest thing in the world to oscillate from a naïve world-renunciation to an equally naïve acceptance of things as they are, and vice versa. In fact, it is highly probable that what we regard as Christian compromises with ancient philosophy and classical culture were really a reaction against Marcion as much as anything else. They of course prepared the way for the corresponding political compromise under Constantine and later. The situation is much more serious for Protestants, because, as we have said above, they are denied the apparent refuge of the old Romanist solution. Be

that as it may, we are confronted in our age with a portentous revival of Marcionite ways of thought. Who would not be tempted to think along these lines, under the threat of Communism, bourgeois materialism, and nuclear war? It is even possible to suggest the name of the modern Marcion, although unnecessary and invidious to do so here. This is why it is a matter of supreme urgency to study afresh the theology of Irenaeus, and appreciate his sense for the heart of the matter, which was equalled or exceeded in the ancient Church by Athanasius alone. Then we must turn and see in what respects Irenaeus, and his other contemporaries, fell short in their task. As the problem is almost certainly in essence one of eschatology, this should be the principal topic of such a study. So far, Professor Bénoît's book, although very valuable in its own way, is simply the prolegomena. This reviewer, for the above reasons, looks forward to the promised later study of the theology of Irenaeus, and, in spite of the discomfiture of such a situation, he can say in all sincerity that he hopes that, like so many critics of Karl Barth, he will have pushed against an open door.

J. A. B. Holland

Church and Parliament. The Reshaping of the Church of England, 1828-1860. By Olive J. Brose. Stanford University Press, Oxford University Press, 1959. 27s. 6d.

Sidney Smith is quoted in the foreword as saying that Bishop Blomfield was 'the Church of England here on earth'; the author, in discovering how true this was, also discovered how important for the study of the Church as an established institution was the period of the victorious Benthamite reform and administrative efficiency. This study is remarkably valuable for its patient examination of the work of the Ecclesiastical Commission of the period. Here we get behind nostalgia about the Oxford Movement. We are not given—as a substitute for examining what was happening to the Church of England—studies of the petulant romanticism of Hurrell Froude; the slow decline of Newman, fearful of his own essential doubt, into the security of Rome; or the biblical fundamentalism which Pusey opposed to German higher criticism. Instead we are given a useful record of how the Church as an institution, through its leaders lay and clerical, faced and survived the insidious attack of Benthamism. When Thomas Arnold assumed in the thirties that no power on earth could save the Church of England as it then was, he was both right and, as this excellent analysis of administrative changes shows, wrong. In those years of royal commissions on Church affairs the politicians like Sir Robert Peel who were concerned for the good of the Church, together with

Bishop Blomfield and his associates, by taking things as they were and modifying them to meet the changing England which came after the Reform Bill, brought a new relationship of Church and State and of the Church and society which survives to our day. In the course of this factually well-grounded study particular attention is given to the work of the Ecclesiastical Commission with fruitful results. Some interesting points emerge, for example, on the relation of the Church and educational reforms, and Bishop Blomfield's concern in the fifties about the failure of the Church to reach the industrial population. Also it is shown that the period was not lacking in that not infrequent phenomenon anti-episcopal feeling among the clergy: a Canon Residentiary of Salisbury wrote of 'the chicaning Prelacy', and the irrepressible Sidney Smith could inquire 'Must everything be good and right that is done by Bishops?' In view of the usefulness of this book it is perhaps ungenerous to mention one small criticism and one small misprint: it is not always safe to take Halévy's judgments, and rarely safe to take his data, for granted; on p. 146 occurs the misprint 'improprietor'.

BASIL HALL

Ceci est mon corps. By F-J. LEENHARDT. Delachaux and Niestlé. Pp. 75. Sw. Fr. 4.00.

THE work of French-speaking Protestant theologians has until recently been overshadowed in this country by the immense authority of their German-speaking colleagues, and is in consequence still less well known than it deserves. But it has merits of its own. It is no mere translation of the work of the more familiar giants, much though it obviously owes to them. Indeed, in freshness and breadth of outlook the French and Swiss sometimes have the advantage, and they particularly shine when the matter in question is one which is in dispute between Catholics and Protestants. The present book is an example of these virtues, and it is one that we welcome very much.

M. Leenhardt has set himself to look afresh at the meaning of our Lord's words, 'This is my body', and to explain them in the light of Scripture itself, indeed of the Synoptic Gospels alone. In doing so he has found himself led to reconsider traditional terms long rejected in his own confession, and to reinstate them in his theological thought, not indeed in most cases in the connotation they have traditionally borne, but in one more amenable, in his judgment, to the biblical usage. Accordingly, the Eucharist is here interpreted in terms of transubstantiation, of sacrifice, of *opus operatum*, and of churchly objectivity. It is not surprising that the author finds it necessary to warn the reader, whether Protestant or

Roman Catholic, against jumping to the conclusion that he is restoring theological conceptions rejected at the Reformation. The warning, delivered in a long and deeply felt preface, is both necessary and justified. Leenhardt has had the courage not to shirk even the terms the Protestant mind most associates with Roman Catholicism, but his claim that he is not using the words in a Roman sense is well-founded: he does not come anywhere near so close to Roman doctrine as the casual reader will be inclined to suppose. Indeed, an Anglican reviewer, for whom the terms, and the practices they go with, hold no particular terrors, is inclined to think that if anything Leenhardt has been over-cautious, and that he has not wholly freed himself from the old misunderstandings it is his concern to reject. But the book is a brave and moving one, and I hope it will be widely read.

The greatest merit of the book is that it starts always from Christ, and never from some 'sacramental principle', or supposed 'sacramental causality', as Roman and Anglican theology commonly do. However, it seems impossible to approach these questions without some philosophical analysis of the data of faith, whatever may appear to be the case in other theological spheres, and not the least interesting feature of the work is Leenhardt's use of certain philosophical tools. For these he is disposed to claim that they are based on 'the metaphysics of the Bible'. Whether there is such a metaphysics we are inclined to doubt. It is on the other hand plain that the author, in common with many of his colleagues in contemporary French-speaking Protestantism, draws upon much existentialist and semi-existentialist thought. This is perhaps most fruitful in his discussion of the meaning of the body of man; elsewhere it is difficult not to think that we can find traces of that somewhat arbitrary 'actualism' which Roman theologians discern in Protestant thought, and especially in Barth and his disciples. Where he approaches most nearly to traditional Western sacramental theology, as in his treatment of transubstantiation, and of sacramental efficacy, the difference in philosophy between his own view and that from which he dissociates himself is clear enough; both for him and for his Roman interlocutors this philosophical difference will evidently seem sufficient evidence of a difference in faith. But are we bound to agree with them? Should a difference in philosophy be made a ground for church division? Must a preference for actualist over substantialist language, or the reverse, be thought of as a difference in faith? It seems to us rather that Leenhardt's faith in the eucharistic presence of Christ is the same as the traditional one, and that the difference in philosophy is a matter where it is legitimate to exercise one's preference. This conclusion is reinforced by the fact

that even those who reject Greek substantialism for themselves are not seldom content with credal formulations in the sphere of christology or the Trinity which would have been impossible without its tools, even though there is no question of tying theology to a particular school of Greek philosophy.

To the reviewer the defence of the term *ex opere operato* is particularly welcome. Why this particular phrase is almost always a red rag to the Protestant bull is not easy to explair, and the common-sense defence of the term here offered ought to carry complete conviction, though it probably will not. Leenhardt makes clear, what never should have been in doubt, that the term asserts the primacy of the *opus Christi* over any supposed *opus humanum* in the sacrament, whether it be the *opus operantis* of the celebrant, or *opus fidei* of the worshippers, or even more decisively, of course, over some imaginary magical efficacy of the elements in themselves apart from Christ. This is certainly what the term *opus operatum* safeguards for those who at present use it for their own instruction, and it is good to find a Protestant theologian who is able so frankly to recognise and state this application of the essentially evangelical principle of the priority of the object of faith over our faith.

On the question of eucharistic sacrifice Leenhardt again follows essentially correct lines in refusing to separate the sacrament from the work of Christ. Much of what is said here will be familiar to those who have followed the modern discussion of this doctrine, which is bidding fair to relegate to the realm of old, far-off and forgotten things a controversy for which men once put each other to death. But his method here has a peculiar consequence: by confining himself to the words spoken by Jesus over the bread, eliminating any reference to the corresponding words over the cup, and by limiting his sources for the biblical doctrine to the Synoptic Gospels, he arrives at an exegesis which seems to eliminate any God-ward reference for Jesus's sacrifice. In consequence, sacrifice takes on a modern rather than a biblical sense, meaning simply Jesus's self-sacrifice for man. True as this idea obviously is as far as it goes, it can hardly be biblical, unless we exclude Hebrews from the canon, to formulate a doctrine of sacrifice which eliminates the responsible self-giving of the incarnate Son to the Father. I could not help wondering, in this connexion, how a doctrine constructed entirely on the words about the bread could resist the conclusion that communion in one kind is perfectly legitimate. By the same token, the rebuttal of the obvious corollary of the reservation of the sacrament, whether for the communion of the sick, or even as a testimony to the perpetual presence of the Lord with His Church, seemed the least convincing thing in the whole book. But the

author's courage had already taken him a very long way, and it might have been churlish to ask for more.

Leaving aside these reservations, the book seems to me one which makes an important contribution to ecumenical debate, and to deserve our admiration on any grounds. The author is not only a skilled theologian, but a moving devotional writer, as he shows in the powerfully felt realism of what he says about our Lord's incarnate life.

The book may also be read in a translation by Dr J. G. Davies, of Birmingham, which appears, along with an essay by Cullmann, in *Essays on the Lord's Supper*, the first of the series of short volumes entitled *Ecumenical Studies in Worship*. It is to be hoped that the translation will have a wide currency amongst those who are unable to read the original. WILLIAM NICHOLLS

A Living Sacrifice—a Study in Reparation. By E. L. KENDALL. S.C.M. Press, London, 1960. Pp. 174. 21s.

THIS book is full of suggestion for the preacher and rich in illumination for the devotional life. Despite a tendency to recapitulate and anticipate, the argument is well woven. It centres upon the theme of Reparation as an essential fact of the Gospel. Within its sweep it includes major problems of theology—sin and suffering, atonement and substitution, eucharist and sacrifice—but each topic discussed is skilfully related to the author's interpretation of Reparation. Although some may feel that the author has to strain the meaning of the term Reparation in order to include under it all that he attempts to include—restoration, suffering, worship, prayer, sanctification and practical Christian living, there is much fresh, stimulating thought.

The argument is based upon the use of ἀντιμισθιά in the Second Epistle of Clement. All Christian life and service are to be understood as Reparation to Christ for His redeeming work. The motive behind this Reparation is not appeasement of Divine wrath, but gratitude for Divine favour. Primarily, Reparation is Christ's work of re-creating and restoring human nature. Men and women are re-created by incorporation into the Human Nature of Jesus by Baptism. But all authentic Christianity must also be reparative in character. In response to God's love towards sinners Christians participate in the continual re-presentation of the redemptive activity of Christ within the Church Militant. 'To put on "the new man" is nothing less than to participate in the fruits of Christ's work of Reparation and restoration which involves the reversal of Adam's sin and the restoration of the dignity of human nature. For the Christian, therefore, the primary significance of Christ's work

of Reparation is that by virtue of his membership of the Body of Christ he is a participator in that restoration of his human condition which Christ has made available to all mankind through the Incarnation and Atonement. The essential difference between the Christian and the non-Christian lies not in the moral but in the ontological realm' (p. 51).

Suffering is the most universal and probably the most powerful means whereby Christians may share in the redemptive activity of God Himself. But just as the suffering of the Cross anticipated the triumph of the Resurrection, so human, reparative suffering is not an end in itself, but looks beyond itself to the triumphant and victorious suffering of 'the Lamb that hath been slain from the foundation of the world'. Christian worship and prayer are different from all other forms of worship and prayer. Here the Christian participates in that worship in which the whole universe is caught up by reason of Christ's work in Creation and Redemption, and through the power of Christ's eternal intercession at the right hand of God finds the effects of His Reparation operative in his personal life. The Church at worship and in intercession participates in the reparative work of the Ascended Lord.

The author examines in the light of NT theology such concepts as satisfaction, penance, substitutionary suffering and reparative identification. A. K. ROBERTSON

Presbyterian Authority and Discipline. By JOHN KENNEDY. St. Andrew Press, Edinburgh, 1960. Pp. viii + 118. 15s.

THE modern elder has become a distributor of communion cards and collector of subscriptions, but his traditional duty was the exercise of discipline and discipline, as commonly understood, has vanished from the kirk. It is an Israel which has no king, but where every man does that which seems right in his own eyes. Denied it, he will 'lift his lines' and go where he will be better appreciated. Thus Presbyterianism has acquired the vices with which it once reproached Independency.

In his Chalmers Lectures Dr Kennedy of Cambuslang frankly admits this. The men of 1560 charged the pre-reformation Church with lack of discipline; they reckoned that discipline which they instituted as one of the distinctive marks of a Christian community; but today it is common knowledge that more discipline is found within the fold of Rome than among the children of the Reformers. Yet even modern Romanists cannot entirely escape the contagion of the liberal Protestantism around them; only small and distinctive communions, such as the Plymouth Brethren, have escaped that pervasive influence.

What is the cause? Old session minutes reveal a surprising concentration on those 'cases' of which Scotland's national poet, not inappropriately, provides classic instance. From high beginnings Presbyterian discipline degenerated into the mere reproving of sexual offenders. Further, the use of biased history has impressed on Scottish minds the conviction that ecclesiastical authority is a bad thing and righteously to be resisted. An uncontrolled voluntaryism is general. But these things are superficial; underlying all is the loss by the Scottish Church of that dominating conviction of the authority of the Word of God which ruled the minds of the Reformers and from which church discipline must spring.

Dr Kennedy examines this from an historical standpoint but, as he would be the first to admit with that engaging candour which no reader can fail to note, his concern is not academic. From long and devoted experience as a parish minister he is concerned with the Christian obedience of the church in our time. The fundamentals of discipline count among the essentials of Christian life so that the recovery of that Christian obedience which rises from confession of the authority of the Word of God is among our primary needs. 'There is a gaping lack in the congregational life of Presbyterianism today in its members' concern for the integrity of the fellowship of believers.'

Dr Kennedy's diagnosis is that this indifference is due to the invasion of the Church by the impersonal ways of modern industrial civilisation and the consequent loss of intimacy in the fellowship. The congregation has ceased to be the community of love. In the household of faith each should know and love the other so that out of this will emerge the shape of Christian living. Indifference to others, when it masters the Church, is a negation of the spirit of the family of God. Thus the recovery of Christian discipline follows upon the rediscovery by the Church of its own nature as the family of Christ where each cares for, loves, and therefore influences the other. A shepherd once commented to the present writer that a stranger coming into a kindly community in time became kindly also; this is a homely statement of Dr Kennedy's position.

It is a little odd that he has not linked the decline in the intimacy of congregational life with that of the family. Only those who have known life in a simple community know what has been lost. It is not a matter of the size of the family, but that under modern pressures the unit has disintegrated till its fellowship differs little from that of a boarding-house. With the loss of intimacy and love, the world becomes a lonely place. As the family pew has ceased to be either fact or symbol, so Church life has lost intimacy and love. With this goes a measure of the increasing impersonalism of our

age; Church members cease to be persons who are loved and become communicants and contributors, to be retained or struck off the roll. People are members of a congregation much as they have a flat in a tenement or a job in a factory, and there is as little compunction in parting from one as from the other.

The minister of a large parish feels this keenly. A card index keeps his pastoral work—such as it is—under control, but his ties with his people tend to become as warmhearted and intimate as those between a consultant physician and his patient, or an income tax collector and his victim. Between the members things can be worse; so the inner discipline of the divine community ceases to function. All who are disturbed at this will kindle as they read Dr Kennedy's lucid and thought-provoking book. It is written with a background of unobtrusive scholarship, modesty, unpretentious competence, and a concern for the well being of the community of Christ.

JAMES BULLOCH

The Presbyterian Way of Life. By JOHN A. MACKAY. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J. Pp. 238. $3.50.

As a war-time chaplain who gratefully used Dr John A. Mackay's *Preface to Christian Theology*, to help Christian inquirers among my fellow-captives, when that little volume turned up in a Red Cross consignment of books to our German prison-camp, I greatly welcome this competent compendium of information about the Presbyterian churches and about spiritual life and service within their fold; for this book could prove of the widest usefulness for putting into the hands of interested church folks.

Perhaps the most gripping aspect of this volume is that it is something of the writer's own spiritual and Christian autobiography. He leads us in a movingly personal way through the background of his Scottish Presbyterianism, and on into the larger life of world Presbyterianism, and of the modern missionary and ecumenical movements. On the way, he seems to uncover new depths and fresh values in our Calvinist theological inheritance, and in the traditional worship and government of the Presbyterian churches.

As I read this account of sincerely held Presbyterian convictions, I was reminded of Dr Mackay's own moving tribute some years ago to his friend from school days, the late Dr John Baillie, of whom he noted that only late in his teaching ministry, 'with that supreme sensitivity and mediatoral quality which always marked his thought and outlook, John Baillie had come to a growing appreciation of the Reformed tradition and of what it can contribute to the faith and life of Christ's Church Universal. . . . He had come to realise that to be confessionally minded need not make a man

sectarian in spirit and outlook.'[1] This is the slant on the Reformed tradition met in this volume which is one of a series intended to provide the intelligent and interested American with an authentic picture of what it is like to be a member of the Presbyterian, Episcopalian, Methodist or other fellowship. The relevance of such studies in an ecumenical age is obvious.

The chapter on Church Order is a very valuable presentation of the Reformed view which Dr Mackay summarises in saying that 'the structure of the Church is for the life of the Church'. Presbyterian Church Order as introduced in Geneva by John Calvin is an endeavour to reflect the 'authoritative New Testament pattern' (in Church of Scotland parlance, 'agreeable to the Word of God'). But it has also to be submitted to the pragmatic test of 'the manner and degree in which it serves to edify, that is to build up the Church, the People of God'. The heart of this Church Order, when worked out, is found in the Presbytery, which occupied the position and exercises the authority which in Episcopacy is associated with the bishop—a standpoint in line with the general tendency in ecumenical conversation of describing 'Presbytery' in terms of 'corporate episcopacy'.

This book is greatly enriched for the reader by the writer's own very wide and varied cultural and Christian background, not least by his intimate knowledge of the Spanish Mystics and of the emergent Evangelical Christianity of Latin America. In his theological analysis of the Presbyterian tradition, he helpfully discusses John Calvin's insights over against the thought of Aquinas, Loyola and Marx, presenting Calvin boldly and vividly as a servant of the Truth, and a doer of the Word. Dr Mackay's programme for Presbyterians today is that 'they must live with Eternal Truth', an aspect of the Church's calling too infrequently emphasised. 'Scenting Eternity in Today,' he writes, 'let thoughtful Presbyterians be inspired by the great contemporary quest for Truth to take seriously the significance for Christianity and the Christian Church in our time of the thought structures of Thomism, Jesuitism and Marxism. Let them at the same time explore afresh their own Calvinistic heritage of faith and rededicate themselves to the cause of Truth and Goodness in our time.'

In writing for us this account of 'what it means to live and worship as a Presbyterian', Dr Mackay makes it abundantly clear that, not to be more than just a Presbyterian is to be a very inadequate and non-traditional Presbyterian, for our real commitment is to the Holy Catholic Church and its world mission.

R. Stuart Louden

[1] *S.J.T.*, vol. 9, no. 3, Sept. 1956. John A. Mackay: 'John Baillie, a Lyrical Tribute and Appraisal'.

Godly Upbringing: A Survey of Sunday Schools and Bible Classes in the Church of Scotland. By JOHN SUTHERLAND. Church of Scotland Youth Committee, Edinburgh, 1960. Pp. 131 + 53 (appendices). 5s. paper cover; 7s. 6d. boards.

THIS Report most certainly deserves, and doubtless will receive, very careful and conscientious study within the Church of Scotland. But a reviewer from south of the Border may be permitted to assert with urgent emphasis that this is no document of merely domestic interest but one which ought to be very widely studied in other churches and lands.

The survey was undertaken in the spring of 1958 in the hope that it 'might provide some indication of possible reasons for the fall in Sunday School and Bible Class attendance that had just been reported', and the Report was received by the General Assembly in 1960. The book contains a number of highly illuminating statistics derived from the returns to a carefully constructed questionnaire sent out to all the parish ministers of Scotland, skilfully and judiciously interpreted by Dr Sutherland, together with a survey of the results of an interviewing of a sample of boys and girls who had left Sunday School or Bible Class, by a team of students from the Scottish Colleges of Education. The latter element is extremely valuable and disturbing, and the Moderator in his foreword very rightly urges 'every minister, Sunday School superintendent and teacher, nay every Church member who has the Christian good of Scotland at heart, to study [it] humbly and penitently'. Chapter X is Dr Sutherland's 'Summary and Recommendations'. Chapter XI ('General Assembly Decisions') includes a list of seven matters requiring consideration by the Church and also fourteen specific recommendations, the soundness of which can hardly be doubted. The recommendations that all pupils who are absent on two consecutive Sundays should be visited (apparently only 38% of teachers make a practice of this at present) and that Interim Moderators should be instructed to do all that they can to keep Bible Classes going during vacancies, though obvious, cannot be stressed too much.

Dr Sutherland and all those who have helped him are to be congratulated on a truly excellent piece of work, which, if its results are conscientiously and intelligently studied and acted upon, could mark an important turning-point in the Church's youth work.

The Report stresses the need for more mature and experienced Sunday School teachers, for more men teachers and Bible Class leaders, for more continuity (the median length of service is at present in the region of three years, and the annual turnover of staff at least 33%), and for more and better teacher-training. With

regard to the last item, it appears from the returns that only 31% of Sunday Schools provide a teachers' preparation class, and that usually only for one stage of the school (p. 129, n. 1). One might perhaps venture here to ask the question whether teacher-training could not often be more efficiently provided for a Presbytery as a whole in urban areas or for a section of a rural Presbytery than on a congregational basis. In England (as far as the Free Churches are concerned) the most suitable unit for teacher-training would often seem to be the group of congregations covered by a local Free Church Council.

On page 131 it is stated that the Assembly agreed 'that the Youth Committee in consultation with the Education Committee should set up a special committee consisting of six members from each of these two committees with powers to co-opt further members, the task of this committee being to examine the purpose, content and presentation of the Church's religious instruction of youth'. It is clear that the task of this new committee is even more important, and vastly more difficult, than that which Dr Sutherland and his helpers have already accomplished. The members of it will need the constant prayers of the Church and the very greatest wisdom and humility, if they are to fulfil it worthily. It is greatly to be hoped that through their labours some at least of the fruits of any true revival of biblical studies and of Reformed theology which has taken place in the last thirty to forty years may be made available for the Church's youth.

The Bible should, of course, be central in the Church's education of the young as in all the rest of its life; but it needs to be remembered that it can be read and taught in a dull, lifeless and irrelevant way, or as being urgently and excitingly relevant to the lives of young and old. Your reviewer is firmly convinced that the biblical message would be much more interestingly and effectively presented to the young, if teachers were encouraged to do more, where appropriate, in the way of practical expression work with their classes. For example, a lesson on Matt. 25.31-46 or on Luke 10.25-37 might well prove exciting and memorable, if by way of 'application' the class were encouraged to plan together some activity on behalf of aged or sick folk in the parish or an effort to raise some money for a fund such as War on Want or Inter-Church Aid. In this connexion some words of the late Professor Schniewind which appeared some time ago in this Journal (vol. V, p. 268) are both theologically and educationally sound: '. . . we cannot properly understand the word of Scripture without applying it right away to our own life.'

The fact that a very considerable percentage of ministers failed

to send in the returns which were asked for (pp. 39-41) is a sobering reminder of what is surely the biggest single difficulty in the way of any renewal of the Church's life—not only in Scotland.

C. E. B. CRANFIELD

The Mirror and the Cross: Scotland and the Catholic Faith. By GEORGE SCOTT-MONCRIEFF. Burns and Oates, London, 1960. Pp. 168. 18s.

THIS is the kind of book about which one would gladly write generously, for it is charmingly written and with an evident desire to do justice to opponents—or rather to show charity. The unfortunate thing is that it is bedevilled by an amateur approach to history which results, not in personal judgments as intended, but in half-truths and the repetition of prejudices. St. Ninian was a Pict (15), at the Reformation the great library of Iona was destroyed (22), George Buchanan was a hired hack (83), John Knox started life as 'a mixed-up kid', he had a 'twisted and malignant mentality', and his sexual life is hinted at as being nefarious (74), John Ogilvie and others had to be sent abroad for schooling because of the breakdown of Scottish education at the Reformation (93), the middle ages considered belief in witchcraft unchristian (102), Calvin 'tragically broke the unity of the Church and led generations into the wilderness of intellectual confusion' (134), David Livingstone was a member of an 'independent Presbyterian church' (132), the Secession Churches are credited with responsibility for Calvinism in the West Highlands (138); and there is much else.

The truth is that the Kirk has earned a good deal of it, for she has long mothered far more than her due share of tendencious history. One can hardly complain if the opposite camp returns the fire. However, this is not the purpose of the book; Mr Scott-Moncrieff writes with transparent honesty, goodwill, and charity, and as a convert to the Roman faith he has given a picture of Scottish Church life as it now appears to him. Often he tilts at windmills, for the Presbyterianism against which he rebels is as contemporary as crinolines and bloomers, but it would pay Scottish ministers well to read his book and learn how a typical modern mind reacts to Scottish Church History as it is sometimes uncritically presented. His title is based on a doubtful interpretation of a Pictish symbol—for the so-called Mirror has no more certainly the meaning given than has the similar 'Crescent and Broken Sceptre' a reference to the defeat of Islam—and in this is characteristic of the book.

JAMES BULLOCH

The Making of a Missionary. By DOUGLAS N. SARGENT. Hodder and Stoughton. Pp. 155. 4s. 6d.

HERE is a simple, honest, wise book. On its subject it is so realistic and relevant that it is difficult to lay it down. There is not a redundant paragraph in it.

The author was a missionary of the Church Missionary Society in West China from 1934 to 1947, and since 1951 he has been Principal of the C.M.S. Men's Training College. His purpose in this book is clearly stated as an attempt 'to explain what a person should do who wishes to become a missionary'.

Its chief themes are the essentials of the missionary call, the selection and training of candidates, the essential characteristics of the modern missionary (as friend, learner, evangelist, colleague, servant, helper), the problems of marriage and family, and the place for the missionary in the young Churches. There is some very searching material on pages 23-26, 39, 50-54, 73-75.

Nothing but good could follow from the widespread use of this book by young people, especially those for whom the call may still be uncertain and tentative. All who have been appointed as missionaries should read it before they go to their field, and re-read it after their first period of service. All members of interviewing boards should read it, and their part in the interview will be more worth while. The use of the phrase 'my mind refuses to inform me' is a pleasant circumlocution for 'I forget', and is refreshing—but that is not Mr Sargent's normal way of writing.

THE LATE GEORGE S. GUNN

Liturgy and Doctrine. By CHARLES DAVIS. Sheed and Ward, London, 1960. Pp. 100. 4s. 6d.

The Paschal Liturgy and the Apocalypse. By MASSEY H. SHEPHERD. Lutterworth Press (Ecumenical Studies in Worship, 6), London, 1960. Pp. 100. 7s. 6d.

THIS first small and interesting book is one of the series of Stagbooks. The subtitle is 'The Doctrinal Basis of the Liturgical Movement'. The first chapter is therefore devoted to the character of that movement, and necessarily involves references to the historical originating causes. Strong emphasis is laid on the idea that the liturgy is at the centre of the pastoral work of the Church, and great importance is attached to the biblical character of the movement. The reader then pursues a course of doctrinal study in six chapters dealing with the subjects mentioned in the brief conclusion which sums up the doctrinal insights on which the liturgical movement rests—'a new understanding of Christ, and, in particular, of the significance of his resurrection and the role of the glorified humanity;

a sense of the history of salvation; an insight into the mystery of the Church . . .; a fresh approach to the mystery of Christ's saving work . . .; a richer theology of the Eucharist and the sacraments; a reawakening of a fuller eschatological hope'. These subjects concern us all, and there will be few readers who will not benefit greatly from their study.

In the second book we have first of all an examination of the Paschal Liturgy in the Primitive Church. The place of the day, the importance of the week, and the meaning of the Sabbath, are discussed, and the significance of Pascha and Pentecost is explained all from the point of view of common worship. The second chapter deals with the sources in the Gospels, but the study is concerned chiefly with Mark. Professor Shepherd does not accept the view that the Last Supper was a Passover, and is inclined to accept the Johannine chronology as more plausible. Chapter three deals with the Quartodeciman controversy, and this is followed by a chapter on the Church's Pascha, as described in the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus, with separate sections on the Vigil, Baptism, Confirmation and the Eucharist. The final chapter of this first part, with the title 'The Pascha in Private Devotion', refers to the Weekly Stations and the Daily Hours of Prayer.

All this is in a sense preparatory to Part Two in which the author seeks to show that 'the outline or plan according to which the visions [in the Apocalypse] unfold is possibly—[he] would say, probably—laid out in a scheme which follows the order of the Church's Paschal Liturgy'. It is impossible here to describe the whole argument which is contained in the last twenty pages. The text itself must be read. One may feel that this second part could have been considerably expanded with advantage. But this may be a preliminary study, which aims to show no more than 'that the Paschal liturgy gave the Seer a basic form of reference, both for the major theme of his prophecy and for the larger outline through which it was conveyed to the churches'. Many readers will accept this argument, and will hope for a more detailed study of the theme. Altogether this is a most interesting and very important contribution to the study of the liturgical aspect of the New Testament.

JOHN A. LAMB

Das Magnificat. Eine evangelische Betrachtung des Lobsgesanges der Maria. By ROBERT LEUENBERGER. EVZ Verlag, Zürich, 1960. Pp. 39. Sw. Fr. 3.50.

Thanks Be To God. By ROBERT N. RODENMAYER. James Clarke, London, 1960. Pp. 126. 9s. 6d.

THE short exposition of the Magnificat is divided into five parts,

each dealing with a section of Mary's Song. The canticle is not treated as an isolated thing, but is associated with the other Lucan canticles and also with the Lord's Prayer, all these together indicating the wide range which the speech of the Christian Church must embrace. The great words of the Magnificat receive full attention, the value of thanksgiving is emphasised, while the humility, neediness and hunger of men are contrasted with the mercy, the grace, the holiness of God. There are many suggestions in the discussion of the words as well as in the general exposition. and the preacher will find these of real value.

The General Thanksgiving of the Book of Common Prayer is the subject of this series of eleven meditations. The author believes that for many people familiar words 'lose their punch through constant repetition', and suggests that some careful thought about the words will reveal depths of meaning hitherto unplumbed. The Thanksgiving was composed in its present form by Bishop Reynolds of Norwich (1661-76), using some phrases from a private prayer of Queen Elizabeth issued in 1596. The central thought is the importance of the spirit of gratitude in the Christian Life. There are many helpful illustrations in the text, and the whole study can be recommended as source material for personal meditation as well as for sermons and addresses. The reader should be warned that there are americanisms both in phrase and spelling. There are two printer's errors, on page 66 and page 122, in each case in the fourth last line.

JOHN A. LAMB

The Origins of the Modern Roman Liturgy. By S. J. P. VAN DIJK, O.F.M. and J. HAZELDEN WALKER. Darton, Longmans and Todd, London, 1960. Pp. 586. 70s.

The Mass. A Liturgical Commentary. By A. CROGAERT. Burns and Oates, London: Vol. I, *The Mass of the Catechumens*, 1958, pp. 251, 30s.; Vol. II, *The Mass of the Faithful*, 1959, pp. 311, 30s.

THE first work is a monument of liturgical research, with results of first importance for the history of the Roman Rite. The two authors discovered that they were working in the same field, and therefore joined forces, to the great benefit of the liturgical student. The problem was that of the liturgy of the papal court of the thirteenth century, its adoption by the Order of St. Francis, and its further use in the Western Church. The older answer to this was that the Franciscans adopted and revised the abbreviated rites of the papal court, and through their wide use by the friars, these rites came into common use by the secular clergy as well. This adoption of the papal rites was attributed to Haymo of Faversham. But recent discoveries have shown that the Franciscans had ordinals

before the time of Haymo, and in consequence new thoughts on the development have become necessary.

The authors therefore study the whole situation from the usages of the twelfth century onwards. There is close examination of the work of Innocent III, the Portable Court Breviary, and the revisions which followed. The section on Franciscan practice and legislation, and the books used prior to Haymo's work, is of prime importance. Haymo's life and liturgical activity are detailed, and the books published after his death are described. Finally the development of the Roman Liturgy from the mid-thirteenth century both within and outside the Franciscan Order receive attention. The story ends with the word of John Cajetan Orsini, later Nicholas III.

The whole study is based on the examination of many manuscripts, and the documents used are listed, and to some extent described, in an extensive and excellent appendix. The importance of this book is due partly to the study of the books of the Order of St. Francis in its earliest days, these being called the Regula Books (Breviary and Missal), and partly to the clarification of the development in the later middle ages, showing the 'peaceful penetration' by the later Franciscan rites into other books such as the Lateran Missal. There can be no doubt that these researches will strongly influence future liturgical study. While there is much technical detail, the main story is quite fascinating, revealing as it does the vital connexion that exists between liturgy and the religious life, witnessed to in the modern liturgical movement.

The book is very well produced and contains eighteen fine reproductions of pages from MSS., while there are several diagrams which help to explain the text. The indexes are full and useful. The English however is not always impeccable, and there are unfortunately a number of errors of which the following are examples: p. xv, l. 24, read 'Williams's Library'; p. 45, note 6, read 'Sollemnia' twice; p. 86, l. 21, for 'ordnance' read 'ordinance' (also on pp. 194, 195, 199, 201, 202, 235); p. 91, l. 12, for 'facts' read 'facets'; p. 134, l. 17, read 'continuous'; p. 174, l. 4 from foot and p. 175, l. 1, read 'St. Mary Major'; p. 187, l. 4, read 'characteristics'; p. 250, l. 3, for 'sequel' read 'sequence'; p. 271, note 2, read 'H. A. Wilson'; Index, p. 582, col. 2, read 'presbyterium'.

Nevertheless this is a 'must' for the student of liturgical history. Incidentally it is certain that Edmund Bishop, a study of whose life and work has recently been published, would have revelled in these pages.

There seems to be no end to studies on the Roman Rite. No doubt this is partly due to the periodical issue of new decrees by the Sacred Congregation of Rites, and to the publication of new

editions of texts such as the *Rituale Romanum* of 1952. And the results of research by liturgists like Jungmann must be taken into account. Crogaert's Volume I is thoroughly up to date, taking into consideration much of the recent scholarly contribution to liturgics. It is indeed primarily intended as a practical guide for busy parish priests, but many even outside the Roman Church will find here a simple, clear, straightforward exposition of the first part of the Mass. The various parts of the service are described and examined in the order in which they appear in the Mass, and each part is discussed with historical notes on its origin and development and on its general significance, while practical suggestions are made for teaching purposes.

The second volume deals with the Mass of the Faithful. It discusses first the Jewish Passover and then the Last Supper. A section faces the problem of the eucharistic sacrifice, and following that, the liturgy is examined step by step, from historical, liturgical and dogmatic points of view. The index, very full and helpful, refers to both volumes. It should be pointed out that the work takes full account of the latest instructions of the Sacred Congregation of Rites and of the most recent *Rituale Romanum*. It is therefore quite up to date, and will be found most useful, not only as a well-documented reference book, but as an interesting and valuable discussion of the Liturgy. Canon Crogaert has been fortunate both in his translator, J. Holland Smith, and in his publishers. The original of this work has been widely welcomed and used in French-speaking countries, and the English translation, which is very well done, will be found useful and interesting by many readers in this country.

JOHN A. LAMB

The Use of Lights in Christian Worship. By D. R. DENDY. S.P.C.K., London, 1959. Pp. 197. 30s.

IT is convenient to have the evidence for the use of lights in Christian worship so ably assembled and discussed as in this admirable volume by D. R. Dendy. He surveys the whole field of western and primitive practice, dealing with lights as ornaments, lights around and upon the altar, the cult of the departed, lights at mass and baptism, in Holy Week, post-Reformation usage in England, and other customs, related especially to Candlemas, Benediction, and the Dedication of Churches. The early evidence is confusing, and it is by no means easy to distinguish between symbolical and utilitarian usage. The author cites the opposition of the Fathers to the use of lights, but fails to remark that this is also evidence that they were in use at that time; and in view of the contemporary practice of celebrating the eucharist in the early morning, the service often

beginning long before daybreak, it is difficult in fact to imagine lights not being used. It is perhaps true that they had no cultic significance at first, yet no exegete can be confident that Rev. 4.5, which speaks of the seven lamps of fire before the throne of God, is a projection of 'the worship of the Temple into that of the world to come, rather than a reflection of current Christian practice'. Surely it may have been both. And it is interesting to see that at the beginning of the fourth century the church at Cirta had '*seven* silver lanterns, . . . *seven* short brass lights, and also *seven* brass lanterns'. It seems odd that, when quoting this evidence, Mr Dendy can suggest in a sentence or two earlier that there appears to be no 'trace of the mystic number [seven] in the fourth century' (p. 1). One is inclined to feel also that he underestimates the influence of Jewish practice upon the early Church, and in particular that of the early converts drawn from the ranks of the priesthood of the temple of whom Harnack many years ago reminded us.

As the inquiry proceeds the evidence beomes more tangible and patient of interpretation, yet until the eighth century (or latter part of the seventh) we have no 'clear picture of the ceremonial [of the mass] as a whole' (p. 81). This appears in the Ordines Romani, but even they represent the local Roman and indeed papal use, and do not allow of the bewildering variety of practice elsewhere in the West. One point does seem to be clearly established: as has been long held, lights upon the altar was not a primitive practice. As Edmund Bishop had pointed out, 'The Lord's Board was too holy to bear anything else but the mystic oblation itself, and such objects, the cup, the paten, the linen cloth, as were necessary for the offering up of the sacrifice. If indeed the book of the Gospels lay on the altar from the beginning of the mass until the Gospel was read, it is to be remembered that the Gospel book was regarded as representing our Lord Himself, just as the altar came to be considered as the throne of the Great King' (*Liturgica Historica*, p. 21).

The author examines the available evidence in great detail at every point, distinguishing between the varieties of lights used—lamps, candles, etc.—seeking to elucidate their purpose in the cult, and where possible indicating their growing symbolical purpose. It is impossible to generalise about pre-Reformation practice, for there were many diocesan, metropolitan and provincial variations. It was not until after Trent that Roman Catholic practice became stereotyped, and even thereafter this was by no means absolute.

The wealth of evidence collected and submitted by Mr Dendy is absorbing, and this is a book which no one interested in liturgy can afford to neglect. The chapter, for example, on the ceremonies of Holy Week presents a fascinating panorama; and the discussion

of lights around and upon the altar clears up a good deal of confusion. The chapter on post-Reformation usage in England also provides much interesting reading, drily summarised by this paragraph: 'Almost all the uses of candles are in practice today, but the price of oil has tended to restrict the number of lamps. It is curious, however, that the one use that is almost universal is a medieval development, while the primitive uses are restricted to the Anglo-Catholic party' (p. 175). To Scots, it is amusing to be reminded of Andrew Melville in 1606 attacking even 'the use of *unlighted* candles in the Royal Chapel at Hampton Court!' (p. 159).

WILLIAM D. MAXWELL

BOOKS RECEIVED

James Barr: *The Semantics of Biblical Language*. Oxford U.P. Pp. 296 + indexes. 37s. 6d.

C. K. Barrett: *Luke the Historian in Recent Study*. Epworth Press. A. S. Peake Memorial Lecture, No. 6. Pp. 76. 8s. 6d.

Karl Barth: *Church Dogmatics*. III.3. E.T. by G. W. Bromiley and R. Ehrlich. T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh. Pp. 544. n.p.

Karl Barth: *Deliverance to the Captives*. S.C.M. Press. Pp. 160. 12s. 6d.

W. A. Beardsley: *Human Achievement and Divine Vocation in the Message of Paul*. S.C.M. Press. Pp. 131 + indexes. 10s. 6d.

Maurice Bévenot: *The Tradition of the Manuscripts—a study in the transmission of St. Cyprian's Treatises*. Oxford U.P. Pp. 139 + appendices, bibliography, indexes. 42s.

M. Black: *The Scrolls and Christian Origins*. Thomas Nelson and Sons, Edinburgh. Pp. 206. 25s.

W. A. Bretherton: *The Ministry*. The Christian Faith Series. Church Book Room Press. Pp. 15. 9d.

R. M. Brown: *The Spirit of Protestantism*. Oxford U.P. Pp. 254 + indexes. 30s.

Calvin's Commentaries, the Gospel according to St John. chs. 11-21. tr. by T. H. L. Parker. Oliver and Boyd. 25s.

J. Daniélou: *The Bible and the Liturgy*. Darton, Longman and Tod. Pp. 372. 42s.

The Eucharist and Liturgical Renewal, ed. M. H. Shepherd. Oxford U.P. Pp. 143 + index. 21s.

G. Fohrer: *Das Buch Jesaja*. I Bd. Kap. 1-23. Züricher Bibelkommentare. Zwingli Verlag, Zürich—Stuttgart. Pp. 244. Sw. Fr. 10.80.

Peter Fraenkel: *Testimonia Patrum*. The Function of the Patristic Argument in the Theology of Philip Melanchthon. Librairie E. Droz (8 Rue Verdaine), Geneva. Pp. 382.

Birger Gerhardsson: *Memory and Manuscript. Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity*. G. W. Gleerup, Lund—Uppsala. Acta Seminarii Neotestament ici Uppsaliensis XXII.

Rowan Greer. *Theodore of Mopsuestia. Exegete and Theologian*. The Faith Press. Pp. 173. 21s.

Donald Guthrie: *The Pauline Epistles. New Testament Introduction*. Tyndale Press. Pp. 319. 18s. 6d.

Frank Houghton: *Faith's Unclaimed Inheritance*. IVF, London. Reprint. Pp. 107. 3s. (paper-back).

A. M. Hunter: *Paul and His Predecessors*. S.C.M. Press. Pp. 150 + indexes. 15s.

Søren Kierkegaard: *Christian Discourses*, translation by Walter Lowrie. Oxford U.P. Pp. 386 + index. 11s 6d.

G. F. D. Locher: *Hoop, eevwigheid en tijd in de prediking van Augustinus.* H. Veenman en Zonen, Wageningen, Netherlands. Pp. 308. Hf. 1.17.25.
Ernst Lohmeyer: *Lord of the Temple.* Oliver and Boyd. Pp. 116. 15s.
G. H. C. Macgregor and A. Q. Morton: *The Structure of the Fourth Gospel.* Oliver and Boyd. Pp. 92 + appendices. 15s.
B. Minchin: *Outward and Visible.* Darton, Longman and Tod. Pp. 371. 21s.
Paul S. Minear: *Images of the Church.* The Westminster Press, Philadelphia. $6.00. The Lutterworth Press. Pp. 294. 30s.
G. A. Mitchell: *Landmarks in Liturgy. The Primitive Rite—A Mediaeval Mass—The English Rite to 1662.* Darton, Longman and Tod. Pp. 237. 18s.
D. L. Munby: *God and the Rich Society.* Oxford U.P. Pp. 179 + appendices and index. 25s.
Stephen Neill: *Christian Faith and Other Faiths.* Oxford U.P. Pp. 232 + index. 21s.
Edward D. O'Connor: *Faith in the Synoptic Gospels.* University of Notre Dame Press, Indiana. Pp. 164. $4.00.
Heinrich Ott: *Die Frage nach dem historischen Jesus und die Ontologie der Geschichte.* Theol. Studien, 62. EVZ-Verlag, Zürich. Pp. 34. Sw. Fr. 2.80.
Heinrich Ott: *Dogmatik und Verkündigung.* Ein Programm dogmatischer Arbeit, dargestellt im Anschluss an die Fragen 1 bis 11 des Heidelberger Katechismus. EVZ-Verlag, Zürich. Pp. 148.
J. I. Packer: *Evangelism and the Sovreignty of God.* IVF, London. Pp. 126. 3s. 6d. (paper-back).
Robert S. Paul: *The Atonement and the Sacraments.* Hodder and Stoughton. Pp. 396. 30s.
W. Pickering (ed.) *Anglican-Methodist Relations.* Darton, Longman and Tod. 18s.
Gerhardt von Rad: *Genesis.* S.C.M. Press. Pp. 434. 50s.
Religion in American Life, ed. J. W. Smith and A. L. Jamieson. Vol. I *The Shaping of American Religion*; vol. II *Religious Perspectives in American Culture*; vol. III Jacob Viner: *Religious Thought and Economic Society, the European Background* (autumn 1961); vol. IV in 2 parts N. R. Burr: *A Critical Bibliography of Religion in America.* Princeton University Press, Oxford U.P. Vol. I Pp. 495 + index. 68s.; vol. II Pp. 411 + index. 60s.; vol. IV Pp. 1169 + index. 140s. Set of 4 vols. £13.
Alan Richardson: *The Bible in the Age of Science.* S.C.M. Press. Pp. 186 + indexes. 10s. 6d.
Eduard Schweizer: *Church Order in the New Testament.* S.C.M. Press. Pp. 230 + indexes. 16s.
Henry Scougal: *The Life of God in the Soul of Man.* IVF, London. Pp. 80. 2s. (paper-back).
M. H. Shepherd: *The Reform of Liturgical Worship.* Oxford U.P. Pp. 116 + index. 21s.
R. Leonard Small: *With Ardour and Accuracy.* The Warrack Lectures in Preaching. St. Andrew Press. Pp. 99. 12s. 6d.
Vincent Taylor: *The Text of the New Testament.* A Short Introduction. Macmillan and Co. Pp. 113. 15s.
Christian Tindall: *Contributions to the Statistical Study of the Codex Sinaiticus.* Oliver and Boyd. Pp. 25 + appendices. 21s.
C. R. Walker: *The Minister's Devotions.* St. Andrew Press. Pp. 128. 20s.
W. Montgomery Watt: *Muhammad, Prophet and Statesman.* Oxford U.P. Pp. 245 + index. 25s.
Gustav Wingren: *Creation and Law.* Oliver and Boyd. Pp. 200 + indexes. 21s.
Edward Wood: *Whosoever Will. Quicunque Vult.* The Faith Press. Pp. 236. 21s.

The Japan Calvin Translation Society announce the publication in a new and accurate translation of Calvin's *Commentaries* on the New Testament and of the *Institutes*, of which 2 volumes are now available, each price Yen 750:

Romans, translated by the Rev. Nobuo Watanabe (3rd reprint).
I Corinthians, translated by Professor Tamotsu Tanabe (1st edition).

Printed in Great Britain by Robert Cunningham and Sons Ltd., Alva